ROMES DESTRUCTION:

OR,

Expreſſe Texts and neceſſary Conſequences drawn out of the Word of God, for the condemning of the Doctrine of the *Roman* Church, and Juſtifying of that of the Reformed Churches.

First Written in French,
by *C. D. R.*
A French Noble-Man.

And now Publiſhed in Engliſh, at the Solicitation of divers Religious Men of this Nation.

By JAM: MOUNTAINE.

Pſal. 137. 8.
O Daughter of Babylon, *who art to be deſtroyed: happy ſhall he be that rewardeth thee as thou haſt ſerved Us.*

LONDON,
Printed by *Stephen Bulkley*.
1641.

TO

THE RIGHT HONOVRABLE AND moſt Illuſtrious Lord,

PHILIP Earle of *Pembroke* and *Mongomery*, Baron Herbert of *Cardiffe* and *Sharland*, &c. Lord Chamberlaine of his *Majeſties* Houſehold, Knight of the Honourable Order of the Garter; and one of his *Majeſties* moſt Honourable Privy Counſell.

RIGHT HONOVRABLE,

IF Books *were to be eſteemed for their* Bulke, *and not for their* Worth: *I would not preſume to Dedi-*

cate ſo little a Book *as this is, to* ſo great a Lord *as You are. But ſince it is their* Goodneſſe, *and not their* Bigneſſe, *that makes them recommendable: the* Book *it ſelfe, I hope, ſhall anſwer for me. For* in It, *your* Honour *ſhall finde* a great deale *of good matter, contained in* a little roome. *In It, You ſhall ſee the Doctrine of the Church of Rome* flatly condemned; *and the Doctrine of the Reformed Church*, fully Juſtified: *And that, not by any paſſages taken out of the* broken Ciſternes *of the Traditions of men; but by many expreſſe Texts, and neceſſary Conſequences drawn out of the Pure Fountain of* the very word of God. *In a word,*

though

though it be of a contemptible Stature: yet you ſhall finde It to be a pretty tall Man of his hands; skilfull in his weapons; and ſo full of mettle and ſpirit, that like a little DAVID (*comeing in the name of the Lord, and being armed with his Word*) *be foyles and utterly overthrowes that* Great GOLIAH of Gath, *I meane the Church of* Rome.

And now, moſt Illuſtrious Lord, *the thing that hath encouraged me to make choice of* Your Honour, *and ſeeke after* Your Patronage, *is, that my* Author (*of Noble extraction himſelfe*) *Dedicated this Book of his to* a Great and Religious Princeſſe of my Nation,

Daughter to that Renowned Prince, *the late* Duke of ROHAN: *by which example, I thought my ſelfe obliged not to diſparage it in* England.

But the moſt prevalent Motive, *and, as I may ſay, the very* Loadſtone *that hath attracted me thereunto, is, chiefly, thoſe tranſcendent* vertues *which I ſee* ſhine *ſo brightly in* Your Honor, *and wherewith* God hath adorned Your Soule as with a garment: *I meane that* Fervent love *You have to the* Truth: *That* Ardent Affection *You ſhew to the* Sincerity *of* Religion: *and that* Inbred and Holy Hatred You beare, *not onely to all* Popery *and* Superſtition:

tion : *but alſo to the* leaſt thing *that might conduce thereunto.*

And for the Confirmation of this teſtimony of mine : Give me leave, Moſt Noble Lord, *to boaſt that I am very ſtrong ; and may, with as much right as any man, uſe in this the common Engliſh Proverbe, that ſaith,* I come with a Witneſſe : *ſince I bring* no leſſe *with mee* than the Voyce of the whole Kingdome.

For indeed, Right Honorable, *though I have been in moſt places of* England, *and have carefully and diligently obſerved the bent and affections of the People : I never yet met with any man*

that dissented from that opinion.

What hopes then should not I have that Your Honor *will accept of this poore Labour of mine, and afford It* Your Protection, *since It sutes so wel with* Your disposition; *and that You shall see in It the* Truth *of that* Religion *which* You Professe; *and the* Falshood *of that* Religion *which* You Detest.

Vouchsafe therefore Most Illustrious Lord, *to receive It with a gracious eye, and to afford It* Your Countenance. *I know that for* Your Honors *sake, it will be welcome to* this Nation, *when they see Your* Honorable Name *in the front of It. And I make*

no

no queſtion but after they have read It, they will love it alſo for its owne ſake. If in theſe times (wherein many looke back towards Babylon *again, and Popery hath been here ſo bold as to thinke her ſelfe at home) the Publicke receive any fruit thereby, they ſhall be obliged unto* Your Honor *for it : but I more eſpecially, who will acknowledge my ſelfe bound ſo long as I live, to be and remaine,*

Your Honours

moſt humble

and moſt devoted

Servant,

J. MOVNTAINE.

To the Reader.

THe Jeſuits and other Doctors of the *Romane* Church, having lurk'd a long time under the Cloake of a pretended Antiquity, perſonall Succeſſion, falſe Miracles, Councels, and ancient Fathers: And now, perceiving that this old ragged covering is not able to hide any longer thoſe Errors and Idolatries which the Pope hath brought into the Church, becauſe that the people whom they have deceived, and by this meanes kept in their Errors, beginne now to know That the Religion which hath the truth of the

the Word of God hath the Antiquity: and that on the contrary, That Religion which hath not this Truth, hath the Falſhood and Novelty. Moreover, That there is no ſucceſſion of true Paſtors, where there is no ſucceſſion of true Doctrin: That *Miracles* belongeth now to Antichriſt, and are a marke of Apoſtaſie, and not of the Truth: as the Word of God plainly teacheth, *Mat.* 24. 24. 2. *Theſ.* 2. 9: That they are forced to confeſſe, That divers Councels and ancient Fathers have Erred, and that they are not rules of the Word of God, but that they ought to be ruled by the ſame Word. They have been

been forced (running from their colors) to forſake their weather-beaten ſhelter, to ſeek for a new retreat, and caſt themſelves into a new intrenchment, there to hold and lurke yet a while, which is to aske of us ſome expreſſe texts out of the Word of God, and neceſſary Conſequences drawn out of the ſame, for the proofe of our Doctrine, and condemnation of theirs; thinking by ſuch means to perſwade the ſimple people, that we have bragd in vain that our Doctrine was conformable unto the word of God, & that we had expreſſe texts & neceſſary Conſequences drawn out of the ſame for the confirmation thereof, and are not

not able to produce any. But theſe Doctors imagining to hide themſelves thereby, have on the contrary, ſtript themſelves ſo ſtark naked, that it is impoſſible for them to ſubſiſt any longer. For I will ſhew in this Treatiſe, with the help of the Lord, that according to their own Maxime and proper Confeſſion, the Doctrine of the *Roman* Church is moſt falſe: and That of the Reformed Church, moſt true.

To come therfore to the Point, without uſing any long digreſſion: We muſt underſtand, that our Adverſaries do confeſſe ingenuouſly, That the Doctrine which may be proved both by expreſſe texts out of the Word of

God

God, and neceſſary Conſequences drawn out of the ſame, is the true Doctrin. And contrariwiſe, That that Doctrine which cánot be proved out of expreſſe texts of the Word of God, and neceſſary Conſequences drawn out of the ſame, is the falſe. And that withall the Jeſuits doe brag impudently in ſome of their Bookes, to have put to ſilence all Our Miniſters: And make their boaſt, *That neither Miniſter, nor any other, can produce any expreſſe Text out of the Bible, that either condemneth any of their Articles, or juſtifies any of ours, though we ſhould produce them out of the* Geneva *Bible*. Moreover, *That by Expreſſe Texts, they doe not*

meane

meane we ſhould ſhew them in the Bible, the very ſame words of the debated Article: but that they are contented with ſuch like and equivalent words. And that we cannot juſtifie any of our Articles of Faith nor condemne any of theirs by any good Conſequence drawne out of the pure Word of God. And in Jeſuite *Verons* anſwer to my Book called *The Caballe of the Jeſuits, &c.* after hee hath brought ſome lines wherein I ſay that the onely way to make them come out of this laſt entrenchment, is to produce Expreſſe Texts out of the Word of God, for the proofe of that which is in Controverſie: he anſwereth, *That it is all he deſireth*

reth of us, and offereth to be a Proteſtant, if we be able to doe it, even in one onely Article. Again, in *de Raconis* Book, containing the Acts of the Conference held between him and M^r. *du Moulin*, Printed with the approbation of the Doctors, *p.* 15, the ſaid *de Raconis* confeſſeth, *That the Church is ſubject unto the written Word, not to goe againſt it.* And in the 31. *Pag.* he admitteth the ſaid *du Moulin* to neceſſary Conſequences drawn out of the Word of God. So that all we have now to doe, is to produce Expreſſe Texts out of the Word of God, and neceſſary Conſequences drawne out of the ſame, for the condemning of the Doctrine of

the *Roman* Church, and Juſtifying of that of the Reformed. Which thing I do in this Treatiſe upon the chiefe points of Controverſie: Whereby every one may eaſily perceive, that according to our Adverſaries own Confeſſion, the Reformed Church hath the true Doctrine, and the *Roman* Church the falſe. And therefore all they that deſire to have Salvation, ought to come out of it, and joyne themſelves to the Reformed Church.

THE

THE MATTERS Contained in this TREATISE.

CHAP. I.

THat the *Word of God is not darke to them that have received the Spirit of God, that they may know the things which are freely given them of God.* Item, *That it containeth all things necessary to Salvation, and by Consequent, that Mens Traditions are vain and unprofitable.* Pag. 1.

CHAP. II. *That it is necessary that all the Faithfull should reade the holy Scriptures, and that they are even*

bound thereunto, by the Commandement of our Lord Jesus Christ. p.23.

CHAP. III. *That a Man can doe no good worke without the Grace of God, and that our workes therefore are not dispositive for the obtaining of that Grace as our Adversaries say.* Pag.27.

CHAP. IV. *That our Lord Jesus Christ, hath fully and perfectly satisfied the Justice of God for our sinnes, aswell for the guilt as for the punishment; and Consequently, that it is a vain and an unprofitable thing to desire to satisfie againe unto the same by works.* p.31.

CHAP. V. *That a Man not being able to satisfie the Justice of God for his owne sinnes; cannot by Consequent satisfie for the sinnes of others.* p.44.

CHAP.

The CONTENTS.

CHAP. VI. *That the pretended treaſure of the* Romane *Church, was onely eſtabliſhed to make void the merits of Chriſt, and to make a little Saint of him that no body may know among the reſt of the Saints.* Pag. 50.

CHAP. VII. *That our good works have no merit at all, and that all the merits of the Faithfull are in one Chriſt alone.* Pag. 57.

CHAP. VIII. *That the Invocation of Saints departed, is contrary unto the Word of God, and tendeth to no other end but to give unto the creature the honour and glory that belongeth unto the Creator.* p. 64.

CHAP. IX. *That the Images of the* Romane *Church, are made againſt the Commandement of God; and that the Adoration they give unto them, is meere Idolatry.* p. 74.

CHAP.

CHAP. X. *That foure Rules ſhew unto us that there is a Figure in theſe words,* This is my Body: *and that the Tranſubſtantiation of the bread into the body of Chriſt, is contrary unto the truth of God, and deſtroyes the humane nature of Chriſt.* Item, *That in all Sacraments, the word* is, *is put for* ſignifieth *or* repreſenteth. Pag. 84.

CHAP. XI. *That it is not enough (for to have eternall life) to eat Chriſts fleſh: but we muſt alſo drink his blood. And therefore all Chriſtians indifferently, ought to communicate under both kinds, according to the Commandement of Chriſt and the Apoſtle Saint* Paul. p. 112.

CHAP. XII. *That the pretended Sacrifice of the Maſſe, was onely eſtabliſhed for to annihilate the power and efficacy of the Sacrifice of the Croſſe.*

And

And that there is but one onely Sacrificator Sacrifieing expiatorily in the Evangelicall Law, to wit, Christ Jesus our Lord. Pag. 125.

CHAP. XIII. *That S.* Peter *was not established by Christ, Head of the Universall Church, and Prince of the Apostles. And Consequently, that the Pope, who challengeth this title but as S.* Peters *Successor, hath intruded himselfe into that Office, without any lawfull calling: And shewes himselfe to be Antichrist, in doing quite contrary to that which Christ and S.* Peter *did.* p. 148.

Expresse

Expreſſe Texts, and neceſſary Conſequences drawn out of the Word of God, for the condemning of the Doctrine of the *Roman* Church, and juſtifying of that of the Reformed Churches.

Chap. I.

That the Word of God is not dark to them that have received the Spirit of God, that they may know the things which are freely given them of God. Item, *That it containeth all things neceſſary to Salvation; and by conſequent, that Mens Traditions are vaine and unprofitable.*

THE Word of God contained in the Old and New Teſtament, is the chiefe and principall meanes we have

to know him. It is it alone that declareth us his will, and teacheth us what the honour and ſervice is we owe unto him. In ſumme, it is the only light that ſcattereth and diſperſeth the darkneſſe of our underſtanding, and by whoſe pure brightneſſe we are led into the way of the Kingdome of Heaven. Therefore it is no wonder if the Pope and his diſciples (enemies of Mans Salvation) have endeavoured, and doe endeavour ſtill to take away that holy light from before men, to the end that they walking in darkneſſe, may fall into eternall ruine and perdition. Now, the chief meanes they have uſed to attain to their ends, is firſt, to perſwade and make the ſimple people beleeve, That the Scriptures are full of darkneſſe: and therefore that it belongeth not to every one to reade the ſame, but only to Doctors and learned men. Secondly, That it doth not containe all things

things neceſſary to Salvation. That it is but a piece of a rule, a noſe of wax, a two-handed ſword. But for to ſupply the Scriptures want, there is a Tradition and unwritten Word, which they cauſe to be received with like credit and certainty as the very Word of God. And with this artifice and cunning, the Pope hath ſet up himſelfe in the Temple of God, and hath changed the Chriſtian Religion, into Idolatry, ſuperſtition and falſe Doctrine; cauſing the people to receive whatſoever he ſaith and decrees, as the very Word and ordinance of God, though they be things directly contrary to the ſame: which things, by the grace of God, I ſhall make plainly appeare by many places of the Word of God, and neceſſary conſequences drawne out of the ſame.

Firſt, as touching the darkneſſe of the Scripture which they ſuppoſe, for to hinder the ſimple people from rea-

ding the ſame: I ſay that in this very thing, they truely ſhew themſelves to be thoſe blinde and incredulous ones of whom S. *Paul* ſpeakes when he ſaith, *If our Goſpel be hid, it is hid to them that are loſt: In whom the God of this world hath blinded the mindes of them that beleeve not, Leſt the light of the glorious Goſpel of Chriſt, who is the Image of God, ſhould ſhine unto them*, 2. Cor. 4. ver. 3. 4.

If the Word of God be dark, it is not in regard of it ſelfe, but of men that are blinde by nature in things that are of God. *The natural man*, ſaith S. *Paul, receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are fooliſhneſſe unto him: neither can he know them, becauſe they are ſpiritually diſcerned*, 1. Cor. 2. 14. And, our Lord teacheth us, that they *which are not of God, cannot heare the Word of God*, Joh. 8. 47.

The Word of God is not dark to them that have received the Spirit of God,

God, that they may know the things which are freely given to them of God, 1.*Cor*.2.12. I prove it by theſe arguments.

Whatſoever is a lampe unto the feet of the Faithfull, and a light unto their paths, the ſame is not dark unto them.

But the Word of God is a lampe unto the feet of the Faithfull, and a light unto their paths, *Pſal*. 119.105.

Therefore the Word of God is not dark unto them.

Item, Whatſoever illuminateth, and makes the ſimple to have underſtanding, the ſame is plain unto them.

But the Word of God enlightneth and maketh the ſimple to have underſtanding. *Pſal*. 119. 130.

Therefore the Word of God is plain unto the ſimple.

Secondly, The Pope and his Adherents, teaching that the Word of God containeth not all things neceſſary to Salvation, ſhew themſelves wholly and abſolutely adverſe to Saint *Paul:* theſe words are plain to *Timothy: The holy Scriptures*, ſaith he, *are able to make thee wiſe unto Salvation, through Faith which is in Chriſt Jeſus. All Scripture is given by inſpiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproofe, for correction, and for inſtruction in righteouſneſſe, That the Man of God may be perfect, throughly furniſhed unto all good works*, 2. Tim. 3. 15. 16. 17.

The written Word of God, hath the vertue and power to ſave ſoules; S. *James* teacheth the ſame when he ſaith, *Receive with meekneſſe the engrafted word, which is able to ſave your ſoules*, Jam. 1. 21. *If you continue in my word*, ſaith Chriſt, *you ſhall know the truth, and the truth ſhall make you free*, Joh. 8. 31. 32. *Theſe things are written,*

written, ſaith S. *John*, *that you may beleeve that Jeſus is the Chriſt, the Sonne of God, and in beleeving you may have life through his name*, Joh. 20. 31. The written Word of God therefore containeth all things neceſſary to Salvation, and it is a needleſſe thing to have recourſe to mens Traditions.

Againe, Chriſt ſaith, *That they worſhip him in vain, teaching for doctrines the commandements of men*, Mark. 7. 7. He would not therefore have men to take upon them to make laws & commandements in his Church: But rather that al ſhould ſubmit themſelves to his doctrine and Commandements contained in his Word, *without either adding unto it, or diminiſhing from it*, Deut. 4. 2. Apoc. 22. 18. 19. *The fear of this people*, ſaith he, *is towards me through the commandements of men*, Eſay 29. 13.

In a word, Chriſt and his Apoſtles, in many places doe ſend us to the

written Word of God, but never to an unwritten word, or humane Traditions: But rather on the contrary, S. *Paul* exhorteth the faithfull to take heed leaſt they be ſurpriſed by the Traditions and vain deceits of men. *If any man*, ſaith he, *yea, even an Angel from Heaven, preach unto you any other Goſpel than that which you have received, let him be accurſed*, Galat. 1. 8. The written Word of God therefore containeth all that which is neceſſary to ſalvation: and conſequently, we need not ſeek after any other unwritten Word for that purpoſe.

Moreover, We doe not reject all kind of Traditions, but onely ſuch as are contrary unto the Word of God, or invented by men for to impoſe a yoake upon the conſciences of men, which God hath not impoſed.

The true Church, groundeth no Articles of faith upon the Traditions of men, but upon the Word of God.

But

But our Adverſaries build their Articles of faith upon the Tradition and the unwritten Word onely, which they preferre before the holy Scriptures, and ſet it up far above the ſame. *Gabriel de S. Maria*, in his treatiſe of the *Authority of Scripture*, chap. 7. pag. 162. ſaith, that If we doe compare the Tradition with the written Word of God, we ſhall finde that the Tradition excels it infinitely, for that it hath more neceſſity, more light, more firmeneſſe, and more authority than the written Word of God.

The Church of God uſeth ſome Traditions, but ſuch as are not contrary unto the Word of God, and which doe not impoſe a yoake upon the conſciences of men: But the Traditions of the *Roman* Church, which (as our Adverſaries ſay) excel the Word of God infinitely, are directly contrary nnto the ſame and impoſe a yoake

yoake upon the conſciences of men, which God hath not impoſed; which is clearly verified in theſe examples following.

1 In the firſt place, The Tradition and unwritten Word of the *Roman* Church, teacheth, That all the Faithfull ought not to reade and meditate upon the Word of God.

This doctrin is contrary to theſe places of the written word of God.

Bleſſed is he that readeth the words of this Propheſie, &c. Apoc. 1. 3.

Seek unto the Book of the Law, and reade, &c. Eſay 34. 39.

2 The Tradition and unwritten Word of the Roman Church, teacheth, That Saints departed are our advocates and mediators towards God.

This Doctrine is contrary to theſe expreſſe places of the written Word of God.

God is one, and the Mediator one between God and Man, the Man Chriſt Jeſus, 1. Tim. 2. 5.

If any man ſinne, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jeſus Chriſt the Righteous, John 1. Epiſt. 2. 1.

3 The Tradition and unwritten Word of the *Roman* Church, teacheth, That we muſt make Images of God, to worſhip him by them.

This Doctrine is contrary unto the written Word of God, as appeareth by theſe expreſſe places.

Thou ſhalt not make unto thee any graven Image, or any likeneſſe of any thing that is in Heaven above, or that is in the Earth beneath, &c. Thou ſkalt not bow down thy ſelfe to them, nor ſerve them, &c. Exod. 20. 4. 5.

To whom will yee liken God, or what likeneſſe will yee compare unto him, Eſay 40. 18.

Profeſſing themſelves to be wiſe, they became fooles: And changed the glory of the uncorruptible God, into an Image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and to foure-footed beaſts, Rom. 1. 22. 23.

4 The

4 The Tradition and unwritten Word of the *Roman* Church, teacheth, That all Christians ought to abstain from certain meats, both in Lent, and other daies throughout the yeare.

This Doctrine is contrary unto the written Word of God, as you may see by these expresse places.

Whatsoever is sold in the shambles, that eat, asking no question for conscience sake.

If any of them that beleeve not, bid you to a feast, and yee be disposed to goe, whatsoever is set before you, eate, asking no question for conscience sake, 1. Cor. 10.25.27.

Now the Spirit speaketh expresly, that in the latter times, some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils: forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstaine from meates which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which beleeve, &c. 1. Tim. 4.1. &c.

5 The

5 The Tradition and unwritten Word of the *Romane* Church, teacheth, That all Paſtors, and other Eccleſiaſticall perſons in the Chriſtian Church, ought not to marry, but rather that they ſhould make a vow never to marry.

This Doctrine is contrary to the written Word of God, as is proved by theſe expreſſe texts following:

To avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her owne husband, &c. 1.Cor.7.2.

But if they cannot containe, let them marry: for it is better to marry than to burne, 1.Cor.7.9.

Marriage is honourable in all, and the bed undefiled: but whoremongers and adulterers God will judge, Heb.13.4.

A Biſhop then muſt be blameleſſe, the husband of one wife: ruling well his own houſe, having his children in ſubjection with all gravity. Item, *Let the Deacons be husbands of one wife, ruling their children*

children, and their owne houſes well, 1.Tim.3.2.&c.

Saint *Paul* alſo calleth the forbidding of marriage, *a doctrine of Devils*, 1.Tim.4.1.

6 The Tradition and unwritten Word of the *Roman* Church, teacheth, that in all places Divine Service and Prayers ought not to be ſaid but in Latine.

This Doctrine is contrary to theſe expreſſe texts of the written Word of God.

Except yee utter by the tongue words eaſie to be underſtood, how ſhall it be known what is ſpoken? for yee ſhall ſpeak into the ayre. I will pray with the Spirit, and will pray with underſtanding alſo: I will ſing with the Spirit, and I will ſing with the underſtanding alſo. Elſe when thou ſhalt bleſſe with the Spirit, how ſhall he that occupieth the roome of the unlearned, ſay Amen at thy giving of thankes, ſeeing he knows not

what

what thou ſayeſt? Yet in the Church I had rather ſpeak five words with my underſtanding, that by my voyce I might teach others alſo, than ten thouſand words in an unknowne tongue, 1. Cor. 14.9.15.16.19.

7 The Tradition and unwritten Word of the *Roman* Church, teacheth, That the Faithfull deſerve Eternall life by their good works, and the glory of the kingdome of Heaven.

This Doctrine is contrary to the written word of God, as it is proved by theſe expreſſe places.

If it be by Grace, it is no more of workes: otherwiſe Grace is no more Grace, Rom. 11.6.

By Grace are yee ſaved through Faith, and that not of your ſelves: it is the gift of God. Not of workes, leaſt any man ſhould boaſt, Epheſ. 2.8.9. Tit. 3.5.

The Tradition and unwritten Word of the *Roman* Church, teacheth,

cheth, That by the death and paſſion of Chriſt, we are delivered from the guilt and puniſhment of ſinnes committed before Baptiſme: but not from the puniſhment of ſinnes committed after Baptiſme, for which we muſt pay and ſatisfie the juſtice of God, both in this life by penance, and after this life in a fire of Purgatory.

This Doctrine is contrary to theſe expreſſe places of the written Word of God.

All have ſinned, and come ſhort of the glory of God, Being juſtified freely by his Grace, through the Redemption that is in Chriſt Jeſus, Rom. 3. 23. 24.

The blood of Jeſus Chriſt, cleanſeth us from all ſinne, John 1. Epiſt. 1. 7.

By Grace are yee ſaved through Faith, and that not of your ſelves, it is the gift of God, not of works, leaſt any man ſhould boaſt, &c. Epheſ. 2. 8. 9.

There is no condemnation to them

that

that are in Christ Jesus, &c. Rom. 8. 1.

9 The fifth Gospel of Cardinal *Bellarmine*, teaches, That Saints departed are in some kind our Redeemers, *lib.* 1. *de Indulg. cap.* 4.

This Doctrine is contrary to the written Word of God, as it is proved by these expresse texts.

There is no Salvation in any other but in Christ Jesus: neither is there any other name under Heaven given unto men, whereby we must be saved; Act. 4. 12.

The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin, John 1. Epist. 1. 7.

10 The Tradition and unwritten Word of the *Roman* Church, teacheth, That after consecration, the bread of the Masse is no more bread, but is transubstantiated into the Body of Christ, and the Wine into his Blood. That Christ is betweene the hands of the

Priests, in as many places as there are Masses said, as big and as large as he was upon the Crosse.

This Doctrine is altogether contrary unto these expresse places of the written Word of God.

Jesus took Bread, brake it, and gave it, &c. Math. 26.

As often as yee eat this Bread, &c. 1. Cor. 11. 26. *Let a man examine himselfe, and so let him eate of that Bread, &c.* 1. Cor. 11. 28.

The poore yee have alwaies with you: but me yee have not alwaies, John 12. 8.

I leave the world, and goe to the Father, John 16. 28.

Heaven must contain him, untill the time of restitution of all things, which God hath foretold, &c. Acts. 3. 21.

11 The Tradition and unwritten Word of the *Roman* Church, teaches, That the Lay people, men and women,

women, ought not to partake of the holy Sacrament of the Lords ſupper, under both kinds.

This Doctrine is directly contrary unto the written Word of God, as appeareth by theſe expreſſe texts.

Drinke yee all of it, Mat. 26.27.

Let a man examine himſelfe, and ſo let him eate of that Bread and drink of that cup, 1. Cor. 11.28.

12 The Tradition and unwritten Word of the *Roman* Church, teacheth alſo: That Chriſt Jeſus ſacrificeth himſelfe every day really, by the hands of the Prieſts, both for the quicke and for the dead.

This Doctrine is directly contrary to the written Word of God, that ſaith:

Chriſt is entred into Heaven it ſelfe, now to appeare in the preſence of God for us. Yet not that he ſhould

offer himſelfe often, as the high Prieſt entred into the holy place every yeare with blood of others, &c. Heb. 9. 24. 25.

By the which Will we are ſanctifiſed through the offering of the body of Jeſus Chriſt once for all. For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are ſanctifiſed.

Now, where remiſſion of theſe is, there is no more offering for ſinne, Heb. chap. 10. 10. 14. 18.

13 The Tradition and unwritten Word of the *Roman* Church, teacheth, That Saint *Peter* was appointed by Chriſt, to be head of the Univerſal Church, and Prince of the Apoſtles.

This doctrin is directly contrary unto the written word of God, as appeareth by theſe expreſſe texts.

God hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the Church, which is his

his Body, Epheſ. 1. ver. 22. 23.

Yee know that the Princes of the Gentils exerciſe Dominion over them, and they that are great, exerciſe authority upon them. But it ſhall not be ſo among you, &c. Mat. 20. 25. 26.

And he gave ſome Apoſtles: and ſome Prophets: and ſome Evangeliſts: and ſome Paſtors and Teachers, Epheſ. 4. 11.

It appeareth therefore plainly, that this Tradition and unwritten word of the *Roman* Church, is altogether contrary unto the written Word of God; and that it impoſeth a yoake upon the conſciences of men that God hath not impoſed.

Seeing it forbids marriage to certain perſons, which God for avoyding of fornication, commandeth to every one.

Seeing it forbids the uſe of cer-

tain meats which God doth not forbid, but rather commandeth to be uſed with thankſgiving.

Seeing it forbids all men to work upon a great number of Holy-daies, thereby depriving them of the means to earne their bread, which oftentimes is wanting on ſuch daies, to poore men charged with wives and ſmall children: the which thing is directly contrary to the Commandement of God. *Six daies ſhalt thou labour, and doe all thy work*, Exod. 20. 9.

Againe, by bringing in ſuch an infinite number of ceremonies, in part taken from the Pagans, and in part from the Jewes, with a numberleſſe number of Pilgrimages and other ſuch like things, as is almoſt impoſſible to declare and repreſent by particulars.

It is not then without cauſe and reaſon, that we reject theſe Traditions

ditions and inventions of men, ſeeing they were broached onely to bring in into Chriſtian Religion Error and Idolatry: as I ſhall prove hereafter more at large, aſwell by expreſſe texts and neceſſary conſequences drawn out of the Word of God, as by invincible reaſons.

CHAP. II.

That it is neceſſary that all the Faithfull ſhould reade the holy Scripture, and that they are even bound thereunto, by the Commandement of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.

FRom the very ſame Spring, floweth the prohibition which the Pope and his Aſſociates make to the Lay people,

to reade the Word of God without ſpecial leave: wherin their manifeſt hypocriſie appeareth plainly, and the feare they have that by reading of the ſame, men ſhould come to know that the Doctrine which they have invented, is falſe, and wholly contrary unto the Word of God. Our Lord Jeſus Chriſt teacheth us far otherwiſe: *Search*, ſaith he, *the Scriptures, for in them yee think yee have eternall life, and they are they which teſtifie of me*, John 5.39. And under the Parable of the rich Glutton, he ſends them ſtill to the Scripture, ſaying, *They have* Moſes *and the Prophets, Let them heare them*, Luk, 16. 29. The Jeſuits and other the Popes Diſciples anſwer, that there is *Let them heare them:* but not, Let them reade them. But what will they anſwer to theſe expreſſe places? *Seek yee out of the Book of the*

Lord

Lord, and reade, Eſay 34. verſ. 16. *Bleſſed is hee that readeth, and they that heare the words of this Propheſie, and keep thoſe things which are written therein*, Revel. 1. 3. If ſobriety muſt be kept in any Book of the holy Scripture, it is in that of the *Revelation*. Neverthelesſe, Saint *John* exhorteth all the Faithfull to practiſe the reading thereof, ſaying; *Bleſſed is he that readeth the words of this Propheſie. Let the word of Chriſt*, ſaith Saint Paul, *dwell in you richly, in all wiſedome, teaching and admoniſhing one another, &c.* Col. 3. 16. Saint *Peter* tels us, *That we ſhall doe well to hearken unto the words of the Prophets*, 2. Pet. 1. 19. The Jews of *Berea, did dayly ſearch the Scriptures, to know whether thoſe things were ſo, as Saint* Paul *taught*, Act. 17. 11. And are commended for it in the Scriptures, being called

called *more Noble than them of Theſſalonica*. It is therefore lawfull for every Faithfull Chriſtian to reade the Word of God, that by it they may know the Doctrine, and judge whether it be of God or no.

In a word, as I have ſaid already, the principall means we have to know God and his Will, is his word, by which he declareth unto us his mercy in Chriſt Jeſus, and aſſureth us of his love. Now, the Pope and his Diſciples take away and hide (as much as in them lies) this VVord from the people: and ſo deprive them of the chiefe meanes to know God: which is to caſt them headlong into darkneſſe and ignorance of their ſalvation, and finally into damnation. For, what can that man doe that is deprived of the knowledg of God and of his wil, but run into damnation.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

That a man can doe no good Worke without the Grace of God: And that our Workes therefore are not diſpoſitive for the obtaining of that grace, as our Adverſaries ſay.

THe Pope and his Aſſociates teach alſo, That our works ought to bee conſidered three manner of wayes. Firſt, as diſpoſitive. Secondly, as ſatisfactory; and Thirdly, as meritorious. Before we be in the ſtate of Grace, they will have our Works to bee diſpoſitive to purchaſe Grace; and after grace received, to be ſatisfactory for the temporall puniſhment that remaineth for ſin: And after ſatisfaction finiſhed, then they will have their workes to deſerve

ſerve the Kingdome of Heaven. A doctrine which is directly contrarie unto the word of God, as I ſhall prove it hereafter out of expreſſe texts, which I ſhall produce out of the VVord of God, and neceſſary conſequences drawn out of the ſame.

In the firſt place, they teach that our Works doe diſpoſe and prepare us to obtain the grace of God. But now, I aske of them, whether we doe good Works before we be in grace, or whether we doe them after? yea or no. If they ſay that we doe them before; they know that men naturally are dead in ſinne; I prove it by this expreſſe text out of Saint *Paul: And you* ſaith he, *being dead in your ſinnes, and through the uncircumciſion of your fleſh, hath he quickned together with him; having forgiven you all treſpaſſes*, Coloſ. 2. 13. Now even

as

as a dead man cannot doe ſo much as to ſtir his fingers end, unleſſe he be raiſed againe: So a man dead in ſinne, cannot doe any good work, unleſſe God raiſe him firſt, and regenerate him inwardly by his ſpirit. The ſame Apoſtle teacheth it plainly in another place, ſaying, That *it is God which worketh in us both to will and to doe, according to his good pleaſure*, Phil. 2. 13.

The holyeſt men, though endued with the ſpirit of God, and ordinarily accompanied with his grace, have alwaies acknowledged themſelves to be ſinners, and very unable to doe good works. Saint *Paul* ſpeaketh thus of himſelfe, and alſo of all others in his perſon, *For I was alive without the Law once: but when the Commandement came, ſinne revived, and I died. I am carnall, ſould under ſinne. I know that in me (that is, in my fleſh) dwelleth*

dwelleth no good thing: For to will is preſent with me, but how to performe that which is good, I finde not. For the good that I would doe, I doe not: but the evill which I would not, that I doe, Rom. 7. 9. 14. 15. 18. 19.

Is it not then a meere ridiculous foolery, to teach, that a man deſtitute of the Grace of God, may doe any good work to obtain Grace, ſeeing that theſe which have this Grace already, doe not doe the good they would, but doe the evill which they would not, having alwaies ſome corruptions of the fleſh oppoſing the deſires of the ſpirit? And therefore they muſt confeſſe, that we doe good workes after we have received Grace: whence it followeth that their Doctrine is falſe, as I prove it by this argument.

If we doe good works after we are received into Grace: Then it followeth,

followeth, that our works doe not diſpoſe us to obtaine that Grace which we have already, and without which we cannot apply our ſelves to good works. But the Antecedent is true: therefore the Conſequent alſo.

CHAP. IV.

That our Lord Jeſus Chriſt hath fully and perfectly ſatisfied the juſtice of God for our ſins, both for the guilt and puniſhment thereof: and conſequently, that it is a vain and unprofitable thing to deſire to ſatisfie again unto the ſame by works.

THat which our Adverſaries teach concerning ſatisfaction, is, That God releaſeth unto the ſinner all the guilt, and

and forgiveth him the eternall punishment due unto it: But that he will have it turn'd into a Temporal punishment: alledging, that if in our Justification, nothing were found but the forgiveneſſe of ſins, it would be perfect mercy; but that there is ſome other thing whereby the juſtice of God appeareth. To be ſhort, The Doctrin of theſe Doctors, is, that God (for the manifeſtation of his juſtice) wil have the juſtified ſinner to ſatisfie Gods juſtice for the Temporal puniſhment of his ſinnes: otherwiſe, his juſtice is not ſatisfied.

Anſwer. It is an old wile of Sathan, which he hath alwaies practiſed by his falſe Prophets, to ſmother and bury as much as in him lyeth, the meanes whereby God is pacified with us, and his juſtice fully ſatisfied. Therefore I aske of them, whether Chriſt hath ſatiſfied

fied to the juſtice of God, or no? If he hath not ſatisfied *it*, *he* is not our Saviour, and we are ſtill in our ſinnes, lyable to the curſe of the Law, *Galat*. 3. 13. But if Chriſt hath ſatisfied the juſtice of God for ſinne; it followeth, that it is ſatisfied; and declared in this alone ſatisfaction of his; and by conſequent, that it is a vain and an unprofitable thing, to deſire to ſatiſfie the ſame again.

Now that Chriſt hath ſatisfied fully the juſtice of God for ſinne: theſe expreſſe texts ſhewe it clearly and plainly.

He hath born our griefes, and carried our ſorrowes. He was wounded for our tranſgreſſions, and bruiſed for our iniquities. The chaſtiſement of our peace was upon him, and with his ſtripes we are healed. The Lord hath laid on him the iniquitie of us all, Eſay 53. 4. 5. 6. And the Apo-

ſtle Saint *Paul* teacheth us, *That he hath reconciled all things unto himſelfe (having made peace through the blood of his Croſſe) whether they be things in Earth, or things in Heaven*, Coloſ. 1.20. Again, *The Mediator is one between God and Man, the Man Chriſt Jeſus, who gave himſelfe a ranſome for all*, 1. Tim. 2.5.6.

Now the Jeſuits and other Doctors of the *Roman* Church (to avoid this) uſe to make a diſtinction of guilt and puniſhment, ſaying that Chriſt hath ſatisfied for the guilt and eternall puniſhment, but not for that Temporal puniſhment reſerved for the ſinner juſtified, for which he is bound to ſatisfie the juſtice of God. But this is brought in to no purpoſe: For I will ſtop up this paſſage upon them in producing expreſſe texts and neceſſary conſequences drawn out of the Word of God, that

that ſhew plainely the contrary.

Firſt of all, the Prophet Eſay hath told us in the forenamed place, that Chriſt hath not onely borne our griefes, but our ſorrowes alſo, which are not the guilt, but the puniſhment of our ſinnes. And to ſay that this is true as touching the eternall and not the Temporall puniſhment, is to no purpoſe. For S. *Paul* ſaith, *That there is no condemnation to them that are in Chriſt Jeſus*, Rom. 8.1. But what puniſhment ſoever is impoſed for the ſatisfying of Gods juſtice, is a condemnation. Therefore there is no puniſhment impoſed to ſatisfie the juſtice of God.

Secondly, The ſame Apoſtle teacheth us, That *by Grace we are ſaved through Faith, and that not of our ſelves: it is the gift of God: not of works, leaſt any man ſhould boaſt,*

Ephes. 2. 8. 9. And in the Epistle to the *Romans*, he saith, *All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God, being justified freely by his Grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus*, Rom. 3. 23. 24. It is not therefore by paying on our part for the punishment of our sins; it being altogether incompatible, freely to acquit and discharge a debt, and yet desire to be satisfied for it to the uttermost farthing.

3 Again, if God doe forgive the sinnes of his children in such sort as he will remember them no more: it followeth, that he will not be satisfied with temporall punishments. But the first proposition is true. *I will forgive their iniquity*, saith the Lord, *and I will remember their sinne no more*, Jerem. 31. 34. Esay 43. 25. Heb. 10. 27. *Ergo*, the last also, and therefore there

there remains no puniſhment for the juſtified ſinner.

4 Moreover, Jeſus Chriſt our Lord hath ſatisfied the juſtice of God for us, either fully and perfectly, or imperfectly and in part onely, yea or no. If fully and perfectly, then it followeth that he hath ſatisfied it aſwel for the guilt, as for the puniſhment of ſinne: and by conſequent, that we ought neither to ſatisfie it for the one, nor for the other. If inperfectly and in part onely: it followeth, that he is our Saviour but in part; for he is not our Saviour, unleſſe he hath fully ſatisfied the Juſtice of God for us.

5 Again, Whatſoever is done by ones ſelfe, is not done by an other: But Jeſus Chriſt our Lord hath purged our ſinnes by himſelfe: *Chriſt*, ſaith Saint Paul, *having by himſelfe purged our ſinnes*,

ſate downe on the right hand of the Majeſty on high, Heb. 1.3. It is not done therfore but by Chriſt. And if the purgation of ſinnes be not but by Chriſt; it followeth, that it is not done by Temporall puniſhment and Humane ſatisfactions. But the Antecedent is true, *Ergo*, the Conſequent alſo. And therefore to deſire to ſatisfie again the Juſtice of God, is to debaſe too much the worth and merits of the blood of Chriſt, and to eſteeme his ſatisfaction as a thing of nought. For it is he only that was able to ſatisfie the ſame, for them that have obtained free mercy. And to alledge as they doe, that the Phyſicke is prepared, but that we muſt drink it: That it is true, that we receive all good things from the blood of Chriſt, but we muſt apply it, is to no purpoſe. For our penall works

are

are not the means wherby we may apply unto our ſelves the vertue and efficacy of the blood of Chriſt. It is by faith that he is apprehended and applyed unto us. For as the body is fed and nouriſhed by means of the corporall mouth, that receiveth and apprehendeth the food. So the ſoule is nouriſhed and ſuſtained by Faith that receiveth and apprehendeth our Lord Jeſus Chriſt and his merits, by which onely means Chriſt is applied unto it for it's ſpirituall food.

In a word, I maintain that it is altogether impoſſible for a man to ſatisfie the Juſtice of God. Yea, even for all men put together, to ſatisfie it for the leaſt ſinne, whether for the guilt, or for the puniſhment. For God is infinite, he therefore that offends him, deſerves an infinite and an Eternall

puniſhment. Puniſhments ought to be according to the offences: And the offences, according to the quality of the perſons offended. And to alledge, that Eternall puniſhments are turned into Temporall, is as vain and ridiculous. For Gods Juſtice being infinite, cannot be ſatisfied but by an infinite puniſhment. And if God through his mercy remits any thing unto the ſinner, he will not doe it by halfes.

Therefore they conſider the Juſtice of God, and the deſert of ſinne very ill, when as they think to be able to ſatisfie the ſame, and that by ſuch means, as ſhould open the gates of Heaven to the rich, rather than to the poore. For the principall means they appoint unto man to ſatisfie Gods Juſtice withall, for the puniſhment of ſins, is to buy pardons and indulgences

of

of the Pope, and give to the Churh; the which indeed the rich may do, but not the poore. Wherupon it will follow, that we muſt ſay quite contrary to that which Chriſt ſaith, *Bleſſed are the poore, for to ſuch is the kingdome of Heaven*, Math.5.3.

Our Adverſaries doe bring in ſome places of Scripture to prove their pretended ſatisfactions; but againſt their true ſence: as that of the Apoſtle to the *Hebrews*, *whom the Lord loveth, he chaſteneth, and ſcourgeth every ſonne whom he receiveth*, Heb.12.6.

Again, they ſay that *David* having confeſſed his ſin to *Nathan*, did nevertheleſſe, bear the puniſhment of his ſin, it being ſaid unto him, *The childe that is borne unto thee, ſhall ſurely die*, 2.Sam.12.14. and divers other places, where it is ſaid that God chaſtiſeth his children.

I an-

I anſwer, That in all theſe places there is not a word ſpoken of ſatisfying Gods Juſtice, who indeed tryeth his children, and fatherly chaſtiſeth them, not to ſatisfie his Juſtice, but to correct them and make them wiſer for the time to come, ſhewing them and making them feele how much ſin is diſpleaſing unto him.

There is two ſorts of Judgements of God; the one of revenge, the other of correction: by the one, God puniſheth his enemies, confounding them in his wrath. *David* prayeth he might not be puniſhed in this kind. *Lord*, ſaith he, *rebuke me not in thine anger, neither chaſtiſe me in thy hot diſpleaſure*, Pſal. 6.2. By the other of correction, God doth not chaſten to caſt away and to deſtroy, but to admoniſh his children, and make thē to profit unto repentance. He chaſtened

chaſtened *David* fatherly, when he took away his childe, and *Saul* in Juſtice, in taking away his kingdome from him.

The Faithfull are alſo called to ſuffer in this life, for to follow the ſteps of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. *For even hereunto were yee called* ſaith S. Peter, *becauſe Chriſt alſo ſuffered for you, leaving us an example that yee ſhould follow his ſteps*, 1. Epiſt. 2. 21. *All*, ſaith S. Paul, *that will live godly in Chriſt Jeſus, ſhall ſuffer perſecution*, 2. Tim. 3. 12. *In the world yee ſhall have tribulation*, ſaith our Lord to his Diſciples, *John* 16. 33. And in another place, *Whoſoever taketh not his croſſe, and followes after me, he is not worthy of me*, Math. 10. 38. Therefore the pains and afflictions that befall the Faithfull, are not to ſatisfie the Juſtice of God, neither for the guilt, nor for the puniſhment of

of ſinnes, but to follow the ſteps of Jeſus Chriſt our Lord.

CHAP. V.

That a man not being able to ſatiſfie the Juſtice of God for his own ſinnes, cannot by conſequent ſatisfie for the ſinnes of others.

OUr Adverſaries have not been contented to teach, that a man is able to ſatiſfie the Juſtice of God for the puniſhment due to his own ſinnes: but have gone a great deale farther, and are come to ſuch a height of abſurdity, as to teach, That one man may ſatisfie for another: and that God accepteth for the ſatiſfaction of the one, whatſoever is done by the other. Now, to give ſome colour to this Doctrine, they

they alleadge that a juſtified man, in this life, may doe more ſatiſfactory workes than is needfull for the paying of the Temporall puniſhment remaining for his ſinnes. And that having finiſhed the ſatisfaction ordained for the ſaid puniſhment: All the penall and ſatisfactory workes that hee doth afterwards, are ſuperaboundant: which workes being applyed unto another with an intention to ſatisfie for him, are allowed as ſatisfactory for the puniſhment of his ſins.

Anſw. I have ſhewed already and proved out of expreſſe texts of the Word of God, and invincible reaſons, That a man is not able to ſatisfie the juſtice of God for himſelfe, and by conſequent, much leſſe for another. Nevertheleſſe, it is neceſſary to ſhew againe, the impiety of this doctrine.

First

Firſt if a man ought and may ſatisfie the juſtice of God for another, it followes neceſſarily that Chriſt is not an alone Saviour: but that he that ſatisfieth for another, is alſo a Saviour of that man. O horrible impiety. *For there is no ſalvation in any other, neither is there any other name under heaven given unto men*, ſaith Saint *Peter*, *whereby we muſt bee ſaved, but the name of Jeſus*. Act. 4. 12.

Moreover, I demand of theſe Doctors, whether a man can ſatisfie for another, before hee have fully and wholy ſatisfied for his owne ſinnes, and have none left behinde? for otherwiſe, how can a man ſatisfie for another, if himſelfe be ſtill indebted? If ſo be then, a man cannot be without ſinne: it followeth he cannot ſatisfie for himſelfe, and conſequently much leſſe for another. But the

the firſt is true, therefore the laſt alſo. I prove the Antecedent of my Argument by the proper confeſſion of theſe Doctors, yeelding us that concupiſcence remaineth ſtill in a man: but yet they ſay (for an evaſion) that it is not ſinne as touching the guilt, but an inclination and an alluring unto ſinne, being onely an originall puniſhment of the ſinne of *Adam*; wherein they deceive themſelves groſly: for whatſoever is a tranſgreſſion of the Commandement of God, is ſinne as touching the guilt. But concupiſcence is a tranſgreſſion of the commandement of God, *Thou ſhalt not covet*, Exod. 20.17. Rom. 7.7. Therefore concupiſcence is ſin as touching the guilt.

Item, If ſinne begets concupiſcence in a man, it followeth that concupiſcence is ſinne as touching

touching the guilt : for what other thing can ſin beget in a man, but ſinne it ſelfe ? But the Antecedent is true : for *Sinne*, ſaith Saint *Paul*, *taking occaſion by the commandement, wrought in mee all manner of concupiſcence*, Rom. 7. 8. *Ergo* the Conſequent alſo : and therefore a man is never without ſinne : ſinne I ſay in the very guilt, concupiſcence remaining ſtill in him. *Salomon* teacheth us ſo much, when he ſaith, That *a Juſt man falleth into ſinne ſeaven times a day*, Pro. 24. 16. *If we ſay*, ſaith Saint John, *that wee have no ſinne, we deceive our ſelves, and the truth is not in us.* 1. Epiſt. 1. 8. *I am carnall*, ſaith Saint Paul, *ſould under ſinne. I know that in me, (that is, in my fleſh) dwelleth no good thing. For the good that I would, I doe not : but the evill I would not, that I doe*, Rom. 7. 14. 18. 19. *It is enough*

now

now O Lord, ſaid *Elias*, *take away my life, for I am not better than my Fathers*, 1.King. 19. 4.

And Chriſt teaches us to ſay every day, *Forgive us our ſinnes*, Matth. 6. 11. and Luke 11. 4. Whence it appeares plainely, that a man is not able to keepe himſelfe one day without offending his God: That he hath ſinne alwayes dwelling in him, and conſequently that he cannot wholly ſatisfie the juſtice of God.

In a word, I aske of theſe Doctors, how ſhall that man take upon him to ſatisfie for another, that is not able to know whether hee hath ſufficiently ſatisfied for himſelfe or no? and how ſhall one ſinner truſt to the ſatisfaction of another ſinner, that knowes not in what caſe the other ſtandeth before his God?

CHAP. VI.

That the pretended treaſure of the Roman *Church, was eſtabliſhed onely for to weaken the merits of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt: and to make a little Saint of him that no body may know from the reſt of the Saints.*

BUt it was not yet enough for our Adverſaries to teach men to ſatisfie the Juſtice of God; and that they may doe it ſuperabundantly, one for another: But they maintain moreover, That the treaſure of their holy mother Church, is framed and repleniſhed with theſe ſuperabundant ſatisfactions: of which treaſure His Holineſſe is the Guardian, and may diſtribute them to thoſe that have not ſatisfied ſufficiently.

ciently. And it is here that they make Christ a little Saint, that no body can know among the reſt of the Saints : Behold we here how they argue, to cloak this Doctrin.

Saint *Peter* and Saint *Paul*, (ſay they) about the latter end of their life, had done ſo many painefull works, that they had fully accompliſhed their ſatisfaction : After that, they ſuffered martyrdome; this martyrdome was a good work done in Grace. Therefore it was ſatisfactory and meritorious. But ſo is it, that it was not ſatisfactory for them: for they had already wholly and fully ſatisfied. It was therefore a worke of ſupererogation. And ſo may one ſay of ſo many other Saints, beſides the infinite ſatisfaction of the blood of Christ and of the Virgine *Marie*, who at the very point of her death, was found to

have gathered and heaped up together a very great heape of satisfactions. In summe, with the passion of Christ, saith *Panigarolle*, Lesson. 11. Page. 333. inasmuch as it is satisfactory, are joyned also (O horrible impiety!) the passion and superabundancies of al the Saints, wherewith is framed the treasury of the holy mother Church, to supply the want of them in whom their owne satisfactory workes are wanting.

All this being builded upon this naughty foundation of their pretended satisfaction, which I have already refuted by expresse texts out of the Word of God, and invincible reasons: deserves not a new refutation. But what Christian man is there that hearing but such impieties read, will not wonder at the patience of God? And shall not shiver for

for feare, to ſee the merits of the paſſion of the ſonne of God, thus trampled under feet; and that they ſhould make of him a little Saint, that no man can know among ſo many Saints, nor ſever his merit and ſatisfaction, from ſo many merits and ſuperaboundant ſatisfactions! O Doctors! how long will ye trample under feet the merits of the death and paſſion of the ſon of God?

Saint *Peter* teaches us that *there is no ſalvation in any other but in Chriſt Jeſus: And that there is no other name under heaven given unto men, whereby wee muſt bee ſaved.* Act. 4. 12. Item, *To him give all the Prophets witneſſe, that through his Name whoſoever beleeveth in him, ſhall receive remiſſion of ſins,* Act. 10. 43. and contrariwiſe, theſe Doctors teach men to ſeeke for ſalvation and remiſſion of ſinnes

in

in the name of Saints.

Saint *Paul* teacheth us that *we have redemption through the blood of Christ, even the forgiveneſſe of ſins*, Col. 1. 14. But theſe Doctors teach men to ſeeke after Redemption and remiſſion of ſins through the blood of Martyrs.

Saint *John* affirmeth, that *the blood of Chriſt cleanſeth us from all ſinne*. 1. Epiſt. 1. 7. and that *the faithfull have waſhed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lambe*. Revel. 7. 14. But theſe Doctors, on the contrary, teach men to waſh and to cleanſe their ſinnes in the blood of Saints departed: which is to reject the death and paſſion of Chriſt, as *Panigarolle* teaches it plainely in his ninth Leſſon, Page 278, ſaying, *It is a great ſinne and foolery to ſay I truſt to be ſaved by the blood of Jeſus Chriſt. Panigarolle*, Leſſon 9. p. 278.

By

By ſo many expreſſe places of the word of God, and neceſſary conſequences drawne out of the ſame, the pretended ſatisfaction of our adverſaries is caſt to the ground and cut even to the very deepeſt roote: as likewiſe their Purgatorie, which they have built upon the ſame foundation. For, Purgatory was invented but for theſe two ends. The firſt, to ſatisfie the juſtice of God for the puniſhment of ſinnes. Now if we muſt not ſatisfie Gods juſtice for the puniſhment of ſinnes, as I have proved it clearely: It followeth there needeth no Purgatory.

The ſecond is for to intrap and to catch money from the ſimple people. For, how commeth it to paſſe, that the Prelates of the *Romane* Church, have ſo many thouſand pounds of yearely revenews? That one part of the No-

bility is incommodated and behind hand; and that the greateſt part of the people ſtarve with hunger; but becauſe theſe men have by divers meanes cunny-catcht a great part of their eſtates, and eſpecially by great Donations that many have given at their death, to redeeme their ſoules from the paine which they thought to ſuffer in a fire of Purgatorie? For, is there any thing in the world, which a man will not give at the very point of death to free himſelfe from going into a fire for the ſpace of many hundred yeares? Will a man in that perplexity care to leave his poſterity after him miſerable and wretched, in giving away all his eſtate, So hee may be exempted from the torments of that fire, which, as they ſay, is ſeven times hotter than our fire is in this world?

world ? Thoſe therefore that laid the firſt foundation thereof, ſhewed themſelves moſt ungodly, and full of covetouſneſſe, which is the roote of all evils, as Saint *Paul* ſaith, *Timoth.* 6. 10. as likewiſe enemies of the glory, and merits of the death and paſſion of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.

CHAP. VII.

That our good works have no merit at all : and that all the merit of the Faithfull is in one Chriſt alone.

AS for the merits of works, we need no long diſcourſe for to ſhew that they have none at all ; ſeeing that the very beſt of our works are full of defects, being alwaies mingled with ſome

ſome corruptions of the fleſh; and man is ſo ſubject to ſin as that he doth not the good he would, but the evill which he would not; Wherefore the Prophet *Eſay* ſaith, That *we are al as an unclean thing, and that al our righteouſneſſes are as filthy rags*, Eſay 64.6. Whence it followeth, that they have no merit at all. For what can ſuch polluted works that are ſo farre from that perfection they ought to have, deſerve at the hands of God? And though they were done as they ought, yet could they deſerve nothing. For a man deſerveth nothing in doing that which he is bound to doe. *When ye ſhall have done all thoſe things which are commanded you* (ſaith our Lord Jeſus Chriſt) *ſay, we are unprofitable ſervants, we have done that which was our duty to doe*, Luk. 17.10.

Moreover, whatſoever is given us by Grace and Mercy of God, is not

not given us by the merits of our works. *If it be of Grace*, ſaith Saint Paul, *it is no more of works: otherwiſe, Grace is no more Grace*, Rom. 11.6. But the ſalvation of the Faithfull, and the glory that they ſhall have in the kingdom of God, is given them through the Grace and mercy of God. Therefore it is not given them by the merits of their works.

The ſecond propoſition of this Argument is alſo proved by many expreſſe texts out of the Word of God. *All have ſinned*, ſaith S. Paul, *being juſtified freely by his Grace*, Rom. 3.23.24. *By Grace are yee ſaved, and that not of your ſelves; it is the gift of God: not of works, leaſt any man ſhould boaſt*, Epheſ. 2. 8.9. and in another place, *But after that the kindneſſe and love of God our Saviour towards man appeared, not by works of righteouſneſſe which we*

we have done, but according to his mercy he ſaved us by the waſhing of regeneration, and renewing of the holy-Ghoſt, Tit. 3.4.5.

In a word, whatſoever abſolves and juſtifies us before God, from the ſame I ſay, comes all our merit: But it is the onely obedience, merit and ſatisfaction of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt that abſolves and juſtifies us before God. Therefore, from him alone proceedeth all our merit: and if all our merit proceeds from Chriſt alone, then it followeth, that it doth not proceed from our works. But the firſt is true: Therfore the laſt alſo.

Let our Adverſaries now deny as much as they will, That all our merit is in one Chriſt alone, and let them eſtabliſh other merits in their works: as for our ſelves, we will remain conſtant to that, being aſſured

assured that by Christ his onely merits, obedience and satisfaction, we are absolved and justified before God: which thing the Prophet *Esay* teacheth us when hee saith, That *he was wounded for our transgressions*, and that *the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all*, Esay 53. and so doth the Apostle S. *Paul*, saying, That *the Mediator is one between God and man, the man Christ Jesus: who gave himselfe a ransome for all*, 1. Tim. 2.5.6. and Saint *John* teacheth it also plainly, when he saith, That *Jesus Christ the Righteous is the propitiation for our sinnes*, 1. Epist. 2.2.

Now our Adversaries alledge certain places of Scripture, which say, that God rewardeth good works: Wherupon they build this syllogisme:

Whereſoever there is a reward, there is merit.

But

But there is a reward to good works, Mat. 5. 12. Apoc. 22. 12.
Therefore there is merit.

I deny the *Major*. For there are ſome undeſerved rewards. A Father may promiſe his Son a fine ſuit of cloathes, if he write a good coppie: Now that ſonne deſerves not that ſuite of clothes for doing well that coppie. For what profit cometh to the father thereby? neverthelesſe, the father will give the promiſed ſuit onely becauſe of his promiſe. Even ſo doth God to his children, giving his Kingdome unto them without any deſert, but onely becauſe he hath promiſed it.

Moreover, a father may be induced to give the promiſed ſuite to his ſonne, becauſe of his duty in doing his coppie well, giveing his father content by that meanes. But none of the faithfull,

can

can doe their duty towards God. *All have ſinned*, ſaith Saint *Paul*, Rom. 3. 23. and *Whoſoever*, ſaith Saint *James*, *offendeth in one point of the Law, he is guilty of all.* Jam. 2. 10. All therefore are guiltie of the breach of the whole Law. For who is he that hath not fayled in ſome one point or other of the Law? And therefore our Adverſaries are very farre wide of that pretended merit they doe attribute to their good workes.

CHAP. VIII.

That the Invocation of Saints departed, is contrary unto the Word of God, and tendeth to no other end but to give unto the creatures the honour and glory that belongeth unto the Creator.

THeſe Doctors keepe a great noyſe, and cry out very lowd that they are the true Church: and that the doctrine which they teach, is conformable unto the Word of God: but when it cometh to the proofe, they are mightily puzzled, haveing nothing to ſhew but ſome few allegories which they bring in upon certaine points of controverſie: Like unto Foxes which runne into thickets and buſhie places

places to ſave themſelves: True it is, they make a great buckler of theſe words, *This is my body*: which they thinke are very cleare to prove, that the bread is tranſubſtantiated into the body of Chriſt. But I will ſhew in its due place, in few words, That they pervert the meaning of this place of Scripture, taking this word *is*, properly and without a figure, which in all Sacraments ought to be taken for *Signifieth* or *Repreſenteth*.

Now I will ſhew what ſlender cauſe they have to maintaine the Invocation of Saints departed, and to teach that Chriſt is not our onely Mediator with God: but that all the Saints in heaven are alſo our Mediators: and that we muſt draw neere unto God by them, as wee come neere unto the King by his familiar ſervants, intreating them to pray for us.

A Doctrine which is absolutely false, as I shall prove hereafter out of diverse expresse places, and necessary consequences drawne out of the Word of God.

First of all then, wee aske of them one expresse text out of the Word of God, or one necessary consequence drawne out of the same for the proofe of this doctrine. There they stand as mute as fishes: Behold then a doctrine that hath neither prop nor foundation in the Word of God, but is meerely invented by men against the Word of God, as I will shew hereafter. And albeit it were not contrary unto the same; I yet maintaine that it ought to bee rejected of every Christian, because it is a vaine worshipping of God, to worship him after the Doctrine and commandements of men. As our Lord

Lord Jeſus Chriſt tearmeth it. *Marke* 7.7.

Moreover, I prove that this doctrine cannot be without great ſinne. For whatſoever is done without the Word of God, is done without faith. *Faith*, ſaith Saint *Paul, commeth by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God.* Rom. 10. 17. But the Invocation of Saints departed is done without the Word of God: Therefore it is done without Faith. *Whatſoever is done without Faith, is ſin*, ſaith the ſame Apoſtle, *Rom.* 14.23. But the Invocation of Saints departed is done without Faith: Therefore the Invocation of Saints departed is ſinne.

In briefe, That Doctrine which teacheth men to pray unto Saints departed, is contrary unto the Word of God, that teacheth, *That we ought to call upon none, but on him*

in whom we have beleeved, Rom. 10. 14. But we doe not beleeve in the Saints departed; but in one onely God, Father, Son, and holy Ghoſt. Therefore we ought not to call upon Saints departed, but upon God alone, in whom we beleeve.

That Doctrine which teacheth men to goe unto God by his Saints, as a man goes to the King by his familiar ſervants, is contrary unto the Word of God, which teacheth us to goe directly to Chriſt, and that he is the onely *way*, to goe to the Father. *Come unto me*, ſaith he, *al ye that labour and are heavie laden, and I will give you reſt, &c.* Math. 11. 28. He would not have us then goe unto him by the Saints departed. *I am*, ſaith he, *the way, the Truth, and the Life; no man commeth unto the Father but by me*, John 14. 6.

That Doctrine which teacheth that

that there is divers Mediators with God, is contrary unto the Word of God, which teaches us, That *God is one, and the Mediator one, between God and Man, the Man Christ Jesus*, 1. Tim. 2. 5.

Item, That *God alone knoweth the hearts of all the sonnes of men*, 1. Kin. 8. 38.

Whereupon it followeth, That the Saints departed doe not know our prayers, which are made in the heart; and that by Consequent, it is a vain and an idle thing to pray unto them.

The Argument which we draw out of this place of Saint *Paul* against the Invocation of Saints departed, is thus.

If there be one onely Mediator between God and man, to wit, Christ Jesus: It followeth, That the Saints departed are not our Mediators with God, and by Con-

ſequent, that it is unprofitable to pray unto them to pray for us. But the Antecedent is true; Therfore the Conſequent alſo.

Our Adverſaries, to put off this blow, make a diſtinction, ſaying, That Saint *Paul* in this place, ſpeaketh not of a Mediator of Interceſſion, but of a Mediator of Redemption: and therefore that this place is not brought to the purpoſe for the Interceſſion of Saints: a thing which is in controverſie between them and us.

To which I anſwer, Firſt, That they are not able to prove that diſtinction of a Mediator of Redemption, and a Mediator of Interceſſion, either by any expreſſe texts out of the Word of God, or any neceſſary conſequence drawn out of the ſame: and therefore that it is falſe. Secondly, That on the contrary, the Word of

of God teaching us, that we have an Advocate with God, which is Christ Jesus : teacheth us Consequently, that he is our alone Mediator of Intercession, aswell as of Redemption. *If any man sin*, saith S. John, *we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the Righteous*, John. 1. Epist. 2. 1.

Veron the Jesuite, in his answer to my Book, *Of the Cabale of the Jesuits*, pag. 18. answereth, That to say there is one Mediator, Therefore there is but one Mediator, is no good Consequence; and he bringeth in for example one that should say, I have a Crown: It were no good Consequence to say, Therfore he hath but one Crown.

But this answer comes from a grosse ignorance. For that is not to be able to judge of what is Consequent to a thing, and what is not. Let him learn therefore by

the ſame example he produceth, that if we aske one, How much mony have you in your purſe? and he anſwereth Categorically, I have one Crown; the Conſequent is good, Therefore you have but one Crown in your purſe.

Even ſo, I aske how many Advocates we have with God? and reading the whole Word of God, I finde that it ſhews me but one Advocate with God, which is Chriſt Jeſus. The Conſequence is good then, Therefore we have but one Advocate with God, which is Chriſt Jeſus our Lord.

It is then our Jeſuits part to ſtudy Maſter *du Moulins* Logick, whereunto he ſends me, ſeeing he ſheweth himſelf ſo ignorant therein, that he may learn better how to judge of Conſequences.

Moreover, God will not give his glory unto another; *I am*, ſaith he,

he, *the Lord, ſuch is my name. I will not give my Glory unto another, nor my prayſe unto the Idol*, Eſay 42. 8. He would not have us then to give unto the creatures that Invocation which belongeth unto him. Whereby it doth appeare, That this Invocation of Saints departed, is wholly and abſolutely contrary unto the Word of God, having no other end but to give unthe creature the honour and glory that belongeth onely unto the Creator.

CHAP.

CHAP. IX.

That the Images of the Roman *Church, are made againſt the Commandement of God: and that the adoration which they give unto them, is meere Idolatry.*

AS for the Images of the *Roman* Church, it is certaine that they are made directly againſt the Commandement of God, (as I have ſhewed before) which in the ſecond Commandement of the Law, ſaith, *Thou ſhalt not make unto thee any graven Image of any thing that is in Heaven above, &c.* Exod. 20. 4. And in another place, *Ye ſhall make you no Idols nor graven Image, neither reare you up a ſtanding Image, neither ſhall you ſet up any Image of ſtone in your Land, to bow down unto it: for I am*

am the Lord your God, Levit. 26. 1.

Our Adverſaries doe anſwer, That God hath forbidden Images, for to worſhip them, but not as touching the repreſentation. But I will even in that, ſhew that they tranſgreſſe the Commandement of God, and commit Idolatry. For if they cauſe Images to be erected for to worſhip them: It followeth, that they ſwerve from the Commandement of God, and that they are Idolaters. But the firſt is true; I prove it by the ſecond Councell of *Nice*, That commandeth ſtraightly to have Images, and to worſhip them. Beſides, let any man ſee the books of their Schoolemen upon this point of Images, and they ſhall finde them all teach, That the Image ought to be worſhipped with the Imagined, making but one adoration of the Image, and of the thing repre-

repreſented by the Image.

When they ſee themſelves convinced by their owne Decrees, Books, and Canons, they ſay, That the Error is not in the worſhipping by means of the Images, but by them to worſhip falſe gods, as the Pagans did; but as for them, they, by means of the Images, worſhip the true God.

I anſwer; By this reaſon, the *Iſraelits* did well to make the Golden calfe, and *Moſes* very ill in breaking of it. For theſe Calves thought to worſhip the true God by means of that calfe, *Exod.* 32. 5. 6. *Ezekias* had likewiſe done ill in taking away the Braſen Serpent; for this people thought to worſhip the true God, by burning Incenſe to it, 2. *King.* 18. 4. and yet God had commanded it ſhould be ſet up. But it would puzzle our Adverſaries vilely to ſhew us one expreſſe

expreſſe place in the Word of God, wherein it is commanded to make Images of God for to worſhip him by them. Theſe men are like unto thoſe Idolaters which the King of *Aſſyria* ſent to inhabit the Cities of *Samaria* in ſtead of the Children of *Iſrael*, whom he had brought into *Babylon, who feared the Lord, and ſerved their graven Images*, 2. King. 17. 32. 33. 41.

Again, theſe Doctors alledge, That they worſhip their Images diſtinctly; that is, the Images of God with the adoration of *Latria*, and the Images of Saints with *Dulia*. Item, That they make their adoration paſſe unto the finall object, and therefore they are no Idolaters.

But that will not ſerve their turn: For whoſoever giveth unto the creature that worſhip which belon-

belongeth unto the Creator, is an Idolater. But the Doctors of the *Roman* Church confeſſe they give unto the Image (which blaſphemouſly they ſay to be of God) the Adoration that belongeth to God: Therefore they are Idolaters.

Neither can they eſcape, in alledging that their Adoration paſſeth to the finall object: For to worſhip the creature with the Creator, is manifeſt Idolatry. And indeed, were it not Idolatry to worſhip Images of Gold, of Silver, of Wood and Stone, with God, with the ſame Adoration that belongeth to God? And to ſay that the Adoration paſſeth unto the finall object, is as vain. For, the Image being then firſt worſhipped, at leaſt partaketh with the Adoration; which is meere Idolatry.

Now,

Now, theſe Doctors telling us (for a ſhift) That the Adoration paſſeth to the finall object, in that confeſſe under-hand tacitely, that they are Idolaters, worſhipping Wood and Stone, which is the firſt object of their adoration: which is an abomination unto the Lord, who calleth himſelfe a jealous God, and that cannot endure we ſhould any manner of way give unto the creature the honour which is due unto Him.

Many in the *Roman* Church, (that are not well inſtructed in the Doctrine of their Doctors) think aſſuredly, that the adoration of Images is *Dulia*, and the adoration of the things imagined or repreſented, to be *Latria*. But that is not their Doctrine. For they make but one adoration both of the Image and of the thing repreſented by the Image. *If we worſhip God*, (ſaith

(ſaith *Panigarole* in his leſſons, pag. 439.) *by means of the Image, God and the Image are both worſhipped with one adoration of* Latria. *And if by means of the Image we worſhip the Saint, both the Saint and the Image are worſhipped with one Adoration of* Dulia. *But it will never be proved, That the worſhip of the Image, is* Dulia, *and that of the Imagined or repreſented by the Image is* Latria; *becauſe both are but one Adoration:* Theſe are the very words of this Doctor.

In fine, We aske of our Adverſaries one expreſſe text out of the Word of God, or any one neceſſary Conſequence drawne out of the ſame, where it is commanded to make Images of God to worſhip him by them. That puts them into a grievous rage, and makes them preſently to fall to rayling in ſtead of anſwering.

We aske them again, who hath told

told them, that God may be repreſented by Images of Gold, Silver, Wood and Stone. *God is a Spirit*, ſaith Chriſt, *and thoſe that worſhip him, muſt worſhip him in Spirit and Truth*, John 4. 24. God is infinite and incomprehenſible, therfore he cānotbe repreſented by ſuch materiall and corporall things, it being an horrible blaſphemy to go about to repreſent the God-head with ſuch things. Wherefore the Prophet *Eſay* cryeth aloud againſt ſuch Idolaters; *To whom then will yee liken God? or what likeneſſe will yee compare him unto? or to whom ſhall I be equall, ſaith the holy One? Lift up your eyes on high, and behold who hath Created theſe things*, Eſay 40. 18. 25. 26. And the Apoſtle Saint *Paul* ſaith, *That profeſſing themſelves to be wiſe, they became fooles, and changed the Glory of the uncorruptible God, into an Image*

made like to corruptible Man, and to Birds and foure-footed Beasts, Rom. 1. 22. 23.

The adoration of *Dulia*, which they give unto Saints, cannot chuse but be a great sinne, and Idolatry: For this adoration is made without any warrant out of the Word of God, and by Consequent, done without Faith, which cannot be but sinne and Idolatry.

In summe, Our Adversaries are greater Idolaters in worshipping of their Images, than the *Pagans* and ancient Idolaters were. For those had not the knowledge of the true God, and were not taught and instructed by his Word. Besides, They worshipped the Images of things which they beleeved to be gods; as of *Jupiter*, *Hercules*, *Apollo*, *Juno*, *Venus*, *Diana*, and others. But these Idolaters here, see by the Word of God, how much

much Idolatry is in abomination unto the Lord: and nevertheleſſe, they worſhip the Images of things, which as themſelves confeſſe are no gods, as of the true *Croſſe*, of the Virgin *Mary*, of Saint *Francis*, of Saint *Dominick*, and others: and are come ſo farre even as to worſhip Tabernacles, Boxes, and ſuch other like things. But if any man thinke that I accuſe them wrongfully, and lay to their charge that which they doe not teach: Let him take the paines to reade their Canons and Books, and namely, the Leſſons of *Francis Panigarolle*, a renowned Doctor amongſt them, and he ſhall finde, that the *Pagans* never came to ſuch a height of Idolatry.

CHAP. X.

That foure rules ſhew unto us, that there is a Figure in theſe Words, This is my body. *And that the Tranſubſtantiation of the bread into the body of Chriſt, is contrary unto the truth of God, and deſtroys the humane nature of Chriſt.* Item, *That in all Sacraments, the word,* is, *is put for* ſignifieth, *or* repreſenteth.

BY that which hath been ſaid already, It appeareth plainly, That the Doctrine of our Adverſaries is altogether contrary unto the Word of God, and therfore it is no wonder, that they have forſaken the light, for to hide themſelves under the darkneſſe of a Tradition and unwritten Word. It is true, they boaſt much of theſe

theſe Words, *This is my body*: and make a ſhew to ſticke cloſe to thoſe Foure ſmall Words of the Goſpel, upon which words they will not admit of any Figure or interpretation, but will take them at the bark of the Letter, to draw out of the ſame a Doctrine contrary unto the Analogy of Faith, and that wholy deſtroyeth the humane nature of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. The which I will prove by theſe foure rules following, which will put us out of all doubt; For they certainly ſhew unto us when there is a Figure in any place of the holy Scripture.

The firſt is, when the matter, and the circumſtances of the preceding and ſubſequent words, ſhew that there is a Figure.

The ſecond, whether the time in which it is ſpoken, is to make a Figure.

The third, whether underſtanding the place literally and without a Figure, there ſhould from thence ariſe an impoſſible thing.

The fourth, if taking it literally and without a Figure, there ſhould follow any abſurdity.

According to theſe foure rules, we muſt examine this place, *This is my body*, and ſee whether there be a Figure in it or no.

As for the firſt, the matter and the circumſtances doe ſhew, That there is a Figure in theſe words, *This is my body*: For Chriſt was inſtituting of a Sacrament. Now, whatſoever is ſaid in matters of Sacraments, ought to be underſtood ſacramentally, and not literally. Again, The circumſtances of the preceding and ſubſequent words doe ſhew alſo, that there is a Figure. For in the foregoing words, the Scripture ſaith, that Chriſt

Chriſt *took bread, brake it, and gave it.* But it is not given till after the conſecration : therefore he gave bread. And to the ſubſequent words hee addeth theſe words, *This is my body, which is broken for you.* But the body of Chriſt was not broken in the Lords Supper; no not on the very Croſſe it ſelfe; therefore they muſt be underſtood figuratively.

Moreover, he ſaid, giving the Cup to his Apoſtles, *This Cup is the New Teſtament in my blood,* Luk. 21.20. the which cannot be underſtood without a Figure : For a Cup, or that which is in it, is not a Teſtament ſubſtantially.

Item, he ſaith, *He will drink no more of the fruit of this Vine,* Mat. 26. 29. He commandeth, *to doe that in remembrance of him,* 1. Cor. 11.24. Therefore there is a figure in theſe words, *This is my body.*

By the ſecond rule it appeareth alſo, That there is a figure in theſe words, *This is my body*. For the time in which Chriſt inſtituted the holy Sacrament of his Supper, was the ſame time in which he would leave the World, and goe to his Father, as he teſtifieth of himſelfe, ſaying, *I leave the world, and goe to the Father*, John 16.28. *I am no more in the World*, John 17. 11. *Yee have the poore with you alwaies, but me yee have not alwaies*, Mar. 14. 7. But hee willing to have his Church to make a commemoration of his death, he Inſtituteth a Sacrament, wherein he ordaineth bread to be broken, and the Cup to be diſtributed in remembrance of him; *Doe this*, ſaith he, *in remembrance of me. For as often as yee eate this bread, and drink this cup, yee doe ſhew the Lords death till he come*, 1. Cor. 11. 26. And that, to repre-

repreſent unto us, That even as the bread and wine nouriſheth our bodies in this Temporall life: So his fleſh and his blood are the food of our ſoules in the Eternall life. Therefore there is a figure in theſe words, *This is my body.*

By the third rule, it appeareth alſo clearely, that theſe words, *This is my body*, are to be underſtood figuratively. For as it is impoſſible that twice two be not foure, but three muſt bee the firſt odde number umpire: So it is likewiſe impoſſible, That a true body be in divers places at once. But the body of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt is a true body, *Like unto his brethren in all things, ſinne excepted*, ſaith the Apoſtle, *Heb.* 2. 17. Therefore it cannot be in divers places at once.

Our Adverſaries would faine cover themſelves with the omnipotency

potency of God; but it is in vain: for the queſtion is of his will, and not of his power. But it was his will that his Sonne ſhould take a true humane body, and by Conſequent, that he ſhould be in one, and not in divers places.

It is moſt true, That God is omnipotent; but he doth not all that he is able to do. For he could transforme the Pope into a monſter having ſeven heads, and ten hornes, and al his Diſciples into Graſhoppers: but he doth not doe it.

In a word, He will not have the body of his Sonne to be in divers places at once, becauſe there would be in him *Yea* and *Nay*. *Yea*, in that he will have every phyſicall and compoſed body to be in one onely place: *Nay*, If he would have the body of his Son which is ſuch, to be in ſeverall places at once.

Moreouer, every true humane body

body is a materiall ſubſtance, that hath his naturall and inſeparable properties, one of which is to be limited, circumſcribed and contained in one certaine place. *Take away from bodies the diſtance of places*, ſaith Saint Auſtin, *and they ſhall be nowhere, and becauſe they ſhall be nowhere, they ſhall not be at all.* And ſpeaking of the body of Chriſt, he ſaith, That *if ſome ſpace be not given unto it that may contain it after the ſame manner as other bodies are, its humane nature is deſtroyed*, Epiſt. 37. *ad Dardanum.* Therefore there is a figure in theſe words, *This is my body.*

The fourth rule alſo ſhewes us very plainly, That there is a figure in theſe words, *This is my body.* For if we take them literally, and without a figure, there followeth divers abſurdities.

1 Firſt, That a body like unto ours

ours in all things, ſinne excepted, ſhould be in an infinite number of places at one and the ſame time. For they teach it is in as many places as there are Maſſes ſaid: and that it is whole in every crumme of the Hoſte, and in every drop in the Chalice, and yet budges not from Heaven: neither is it in the ſpace which is between both, and by Conſequent, that one and the ſelfe ſame body, may be higher and lower than it ſelfe, and that there is ſome diſtance between Chriſts body and the body of Chriſt.

2 Secondly, That a true body hath all its parts under one point, having the head where the feet are, the eyes, mouth, and eares altogether: and by Conſequent, it hath a length without extent, that is, a length and no length.

3 Thirdly, That Chriſt did eat him-

himſelfe, and drank his own body and blood, ſeeing (after their own Doctrine) his body is alſo in the Chalice. And that by Conſequent, he had his head in his mouth, and his whole body in his ſtomack, having the inſide out, and the outſide in, which is a thing more abſurd than if the ſcabberd were in the ſword; For being in the ſword, it were in another thing than it ſelfe. But theſe Doctors put the body of Chriſt into the body of Chriſt.

4 Fourthly, That there is a Chriſt ſuffering, and a Chriſt not ſuffering: A Chriſt crucified, and a Chriſt not crucified. For as ſoone as Chriſt had ſupped, he went to the Garden of Olives, where he ſwate great drops of blood, was apprehended, and finally, Crucified. But the ſame that was in his and the Apoſtles ſtomacks, did not ſweat great drops

of

of blood, was not apprehended, nor crucified: And by Conſequent, he was not our Saviour, ſeeing he hath not ſuffered for us.

It appeareth therefore plainly by that which hath bin above ſaid, That theſe words, *This is my body*, muſt not be taken literally, but figuratively.

Nevertheleſſe, our Adverſaries are ſo wilfull and obſtinate in this, as to affirme ſtill, That theſe words muſt be taken literally and without a figure: and that the bread of the Maſſe, is tranſubſtantiated into the body of Chriſt: alledging, that God is able to doe it: but as I have ſaid already, the Queſtion is of his will, and not of his power. They ſhould have proved firſt, That it is his Truth and his Will, before they goe about to tell us of his power. There is no opinion ſo extravagant or fantaſticall,

ſticall, but may be maintained in ſaying that God is powerfull enough to make it to bee ſo. To prove a doctrine, onely becauſe God is omnipotent; is an open confeſſion of their weakeneſſe. There be ſome things that God cannot doe, becauſe he is omnipotent. He cannot lye: He cannot contradict himſelfe. Gods omnipotencie ought not to be a cloake unto Error, nor ſerve as a refuge to falſhood and Idolatry. Therefore wee muſt ſee firſt whether it bee his truth or no.

1. In the firſt place, the Apoſtle to the *Hebrewes* telleth us, that *Chriſt is like unto his brethren in all things, ſinne excepted*, Heb. 2. 16. 17. Therefore it is a thing contrarie unto the truth of God, to teach that he may be in a million of places at one and the ſame time.

For

For to have a true body, and to be like unto his brethren in al things, he muſt be in one, and not in many places.

2. Himſelfe tels us that *hee leaveth the world, and goes to the Father*, John 16. 28. That *hee is no more in the world.* John 17. 11. That *we ſhall have the poore alwayes, but we ſhall not have him alwayes.* Marke 14. 7. It is therefore a thing contrary unto the truth of God, to teach that he is here on earth in a million of places at once. They anſwer to this, that we have Chriſt no more viſibly: but that wee have him inviſibly under the *Species* of the bread and wine.

But that will not ſerve their turne. For, to have Chriſt inviſibly, is ſtill to have Chriſt. That man were a lyer that ſhould ſay he had no clothes, becauſe they

are

are hid in a trunke. Even ſo hee were a lyer that ſhould ſay he had not Chriſt, becauſe he is hidden under the *Species* of bread and wine. But he ſaith expreſly, *Wee ſhall not have him alwayes*; That *he leaves the World, and goes to the Father*. Sentences which ſhould be falſe if he were yet in the world betweene the hands of a Prieſt ſaying Maſſe, or lockt up in a pix or box. And as touching that which hee ſaith, *Matth.* 28. 20. That *hee ſhall be with us unto the end of the World*: That is very true not according to his Humane nature, but according to his Divinity, power and efficacie of the holy Ghoſt, whereby he guideth, governeth, and ruleth his Church. *We have Chriſt alwayes, according to the preſence of his Majeſty*, ſaith Saint Auſtin; *but according to the preſence of his fleſh, it was truly ſaid*

unto the Apoſtles, Ye ſhall not have me alwayes, Auguſt. 50 Treatiſe upon Saint John.

3. Saint *Peter* ſaith, That *Heaven muſt containe him untill the times of reſtitution of all things, which God hath ſpoken by the mouth of all his holy Prophets ſince the World began*, Acts 3. 21. It is therefore a thing contrary unto the Truth of God, to teach that he is here on earth below in the hands of a Prieſt, in as many places as there are Maſſes ſaid.

4. In the Apoſtles Creed we beleeve and confeſſe, That *he aſcended into heaven, and ſits at the right hand of God the Father*. Item, That *from thence hee ſhall come to judge the quick and the dead*, Therefore it is a thing contrary unto the truth of God, to teach that he is here below on earth in the hands of a Prieſt, in as many places

places as there are Maſſes ſaid.

But for aſmuch as they alledge, without any reſpect to Gods truth, that it is his wil, manifeſted in theſe words *This is my body*: I wil ſhew that it is no more his will, which cannot be contrary to his truth. For the will of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt was to inſtitute a Sacrament. But in all Sacraments there ſhould be two diſtinct things; to wit, the ſigne, and the thing ſignified; the one thing terreſtriall, and the other celeſtiall. It was his wil therefore that theſe two things ſhould be in the Sacrament of the ſupper, which he inſtituted: that is, the bread and the wine, which are the ſigne and the terreſtriall thing: And his body and blood, which are the celeſtiall and ſignified thing. The ſignes received by the corporal mouth, and the thing ſignified by faith, according to

that which the Apoſtle ſaith, *Chriſt dwelleth in your hearts by faith.* Epheſ. 3. 17. Whereupon it followeth that it was not his will, that the bread and wine ſhould be tranſubſtantiated into his body, which they ſhould ſignifie. And indeed, he did not ſay, *this is tranſubſtantiated into my body*: but only, *This is my body*. And that conformably unto the ſtyle of the holy Scripture, which giveth alwayes to the ſigne the name of the thing ſignified, uſing in all Sacraments the word *is* for *ſignifieth*.

But foraſmuch as all the difficulty lyeth upon this word *is*, to know whether it ought to be taken properly, or by *ſignifieth* in this enunciation, *this is my body*: I prove that it ought not to be taken properly, but by *ſignifieth*. Here is my argument. If in all Sacraments, the ſignes doe beare

beare the name of the things ſignified: *Item*, if the word *is*, is put for *ſignifieth* or *repreſenteth*: It followeth that the bread and the wine, which are ſignes in the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, ought to beare the name of the body and blood of Chriſt. *Item*, that the word *is*, is put for *ſignifieth* or *repreſenteth*. But the firſt propoſition is true. Here are my proofes.

1. The Circumciſion was a Sacrament among the Jewes, that ſignified the Covenant of God, as it is ſaid in the 17 of *Geneſis*, verſ. 10. 2. 4. 7. *Every man-childe among you ſhall be circumciſed, and ye ſhall circumciſe the fleſh of your foreskin, and it ſhall be a token of the covenant betwixt mee and you.* But in the ſame chapter this Circumciſion is called the Covenant it ſelfe, *I will make my Covenant*

betweene me and thee. As for mee, behold my Covenant is with thee. I will eſtabliſh my Covenant betweene me and thee. All that is ſaid of the Circumciſion; it was then called the Covenant, of the name of the thing whereof it was a ſigne. So Chriſt following the ſtyle of the holy Scripture, did call the bread his body.

2. The Paſchall Lambe was alſo a Sacrament among the Jews, which repreſented the paſſeover of the Angel that paſſed by in Egypt. Nevertheleſſe it is called even the paſſeover it ſelfe. *And thus ſhall ye eate it: with your loynes girded, your ſhooes on your feet, and your ſtaffe in your hand: and ye ſhall eate it in haſte: for it is the Lords paſſeover.* Exod. 12. 11.

3. The Arke of the Covenant was alſo a Sacrament among the Jewes, which repreſented the Lord:

Lord : but it is called the Lord himſelfe in the Word of God, as we ſee in theſe words, *And David aroſe and went with all the people that were with him, from Baal of Judi to bring up from thence the Arke of God whoſe name is called by the name of the Lord of hoſtes that dwelleth upon it betweene the Cherubins*, 2 Sam. 6.2.

4. The Rock from which came out waters in the Wilderneſſe, was alſo a ſigne and a ſacrament among the Jewes, that ſignified the refection and ſpirituall food which the faithfull have in our Lord Jeſus Chriſt: but it is called Chriſt, even by Saint *Paul*. *Our Fathers did all eate the ſame ſpirituall meate : and did all drinke the ſame ſpirituall drink : for they all drank of that ſpirituall rock that followed them: and that Rock was Chriſt*, 1. Cor. 10. 3.4.

Panigarolle in his Leſſons, page 477. deceiveth himſelfe groſly, being of opinion that in this place Chriſt is called a rock, and therefore that this word *Was*, is to be taken for *being*, and not for *ſignifying*. 1. For if it were the ſence and meaning of the Apoſtle, he would not have ſaid that the rock was Chriſt, but that Chriſt was the rocke. 2. Alſo he would not have ſaid in the paſſive tenſe *was*, but in the preſent tenſe *is* : For he is alwayes both the fundamentall and chiefe corner ſtone of the Church.

3. To diſcerne the truth, wee muſt but conſider the words of the Apoſtle : for hee ſaith That our Fathers *did all eate of the ſame ſpirituall meate, and did all drinke of the ſame ſpirituall drinke*, 1. Cor. 10. 2. But this ſpirituall meate was the *Manna*. *Exod.* 16. 15. which

which he calleth ſpirituall becauſe it was a figure of Chriſt: Likewiſe, this ſpirituall drinke, was the water iſſuing forth of the rock. *Exod.* 17. 6. *Numb.* 20. 10. 11. which alſo he calleth ſpirituall drinke, becauſe its ſignification was ſpirituall. But as by this ſpirituall meat, Saint *Paul* did not meane Chriſt himſelfe: So by this ſpirituall drinke he did not underſtand Chriſt himſelfe, but the water that flowed out of the Rock. It is therefore cleare enough, that this Rock whereof he ſpeaketh, is the ſame whence the waters flowed in the Wilderneſſe, which he calleth Chriſt, becauſe it was a figure of Chriſt.

The which is plainely ſhewed in the foregoing words of *Sea*, and *Cloude*. For the *Sea*, the *Cloude*, and the *Rock* are uſed in one and the ſelfe ſame kind, and to one and

and the ſelfe ſame end. Even ſo then as it was a true Sea, and a true cloude: ſo this Rock was a true Rock. And it is ſaid it followed the people: becauſe the ſtreames of waters that iſſued forth of this Rock, followed this people a long time in the Wilderneſſe.

Againe, Chriſt ſaith, That *he is the true Vine*, John 15. 1. That *he is the doore of the Sheep*, John 10. 7. And Saint *Paul* ſaith, That *the bread which we break, is the Communion of the body of Chriſt*, 1. Cor. 10. 16. Howbeit the bread is not the Communion it ſelfe, but a Sacrament thereof.

As for Baptiſme, S. *Paul* ſaith, That *by it we are buried with Chriſt*, Rom. 6. 4. Col. 2. 12. becauſe it repreſenteth the death of the old man, and of our naturall corruption.

But

But without going from the Sacrament, whereof we now treat, there is ſufficient matter to ſhew plainly, That in theſe words, *This is my body*, the word *is*, is put for *ſignifieth*, or *repreſenteth*: For Chriſt ſaith, *This is my body which is broken for you*. But if we ſhould here take this word *is*, properly and without a figure, it would follow, That the body of Chriſt was broken at the Sacrament of the Lords Supper: which is a thing contrary unto the Word of God, that ſaith, *He was not broken, that the Scripture ſhould be fulfilled which ſaith, that a bone of him ſhall not be broken*, John 19.33.36.

Now we muſt note, That this word *is*, is found here twiſe in the ſame place, and within three words one of another, viz. *This is my body, which is broken for you, &c.* Theſe ſubtill Doctors, enemies of figures,

figures, will take the firſt properly, and without a figure, in theſe words, *This is my body*: but in the words following, *which is broken for you, &c.* they take it figuratively, ſaying, that *breaking* is attributed to the body of Chriſt, becauſe the *ſpecies* which cover it, are broken by the Prieſt, that is to ſay, the colour, the quantity, the meaſures. A brave ſubtilty; for according to this Doctrine, an arme ſhall be broken, becauſe the ſleeve that containeth it, is broken.

But here is yet more. S. *Luke*, and S. *Paul* ſay, That *the Cup is the New Teſtament, &c.* Luk. 22. 20. 1. Cor. 11. 25. Out of which we draw this infallible concluſion. If the Cup, or that which is in the Cup, cannot be the new Teſtament ſubſtantially, but onely Sacramentally: It followeth, that this

this word *is*, ought to be expounded in this place for *ſignifieth* or *repreſenteth*. But the firſt is true; Therefore the laſt alſo.

Our Adverſaries deny the Antecedent: affirming, That the Cup or that which is in the Cup, is the New Teſtament properly, and without a figure: and perceiving very well, that the bread is the Lords body in the ſame kind as the Cup is the New Teſtament: and that if the word, *is*, muſt be expounded for *ſignifieth* or *repreſenteth*, in this enunciation, *This Cup is the New Teſtament, &c.* that it muſt be expounded ſo in this enunciation, *This is my body*.

But this hole is too little to creep out at. For behold, Saint *Mathew* ſaith, That *this blood is the blood of the New Teſtament*, Mat. 26. 28. Therefore it is not the New Teſtament. For even as the foure

corner

corner Cap of a Jeſuite is not a Jeſuite: ſo the blood of the New Teſtament, is not the New Teſtament.

Adde moreover, that our Adverſaries tell us, That the New Teſtament is founded upon the blood which they ſay is in the Chalice. Therefore by their own Doctrine, it is not the New Teſtament: for one thing founded upon another, is not the ſame thing with it.

In ſumme, Chriſt ſaith, *This Cup is the New Teſtament in my blood.* Therefore it is not his blood; For a thing which is in another, is not the ſame thing in which it is.

By ſo many expreſſe texts, and invincible reaſons, is this propoſition evidently proved: That in all Sacraments, the ſignes do beare the name of the thing ſignified; and that this word *is*, is put for *ſignifieth* or *repreſenteth*; and Conſequently,

ſequently, that the bread and wine, remaining ſtill bread and wine, at the Sacrament of the Lords ſupper, doe beare the name of the body and blood of Chriſt whom they ſignifie. And therefore the meaning of theſe words, *this is my body*, is, *This ſignifieth* or *repreſenteth my body*: as divers Fathers have expounded it, and namely, Saint *Auſtin* in theſe words: *The Lord made no difficulty to ſay, This is my body, when he gave the ſigne of his body.* *Auſtin* againſt *Adimentus* chap. 12. And *Tertullian* alſo in theſe words: *Chriſt having taken bread and diſtributed it to his Diſciples, made it to be his body, ſaying this is my body*, that is, *the figure of my body*, *Tertullian* contra *Marcion*, chap. 40. Whereby it appeareth that this popiſh doctrin is no leſſe contrary unto the wil of God than unto his truth manifeſted in his Word.

CHAP.

CHAP. XI.

That it is not enough (for to have Eternall life) to eate Christs flesh: but that we must also drinke his blood; And therefore all Christians indifferently ought to communicate under both kindes, according to the Commandement of Christ, and the Apostle Saint Paul.

THE Pope and his Associats doe keepe men easily in their Idolatry and false doctrines, by these two meanes. The first, in holding them in a more than brutish ignorance, using them like beasts. The second, by sweet alluring speeches wherewith they cover the poyson which they give unto the simple to drink. It is a thing worthy of compassi-

on

on to ſee ſometimes theſe Doctors in the Pulpit torment themſelves, gnaſh their teeth for anger, and ſpew out a thouſand injuries, ſlanders, & forg'd imputations againſt the good ſervants of God, and eſpecially againſt *Calvin*. For the very remembrance of the name of that good Doctor, is able to make them ſtark mad: mingling in their ſermons among their injuries, ſome words of Piety, recommendation, and praiſe of good workes, to amuſe their hearers, and entertaine them in that opinion, that they preach a true, and wholeſome doctrine. This is the cauſe that Papiſts ſometimes doe intreat us to goe heare their ſermons. O ſilly people, ye have not yet learned what the depths of Satan are, that can transforme himſelfe into an Angel of light for to ſeduce men. *Apoc.* 2.24. Ye

hearken not to Christs warning, when he saith, *Beware of false Prophets which come to you in sheepes clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolfes.* Math. 7. 15. Ye know not that *Antichrist hath two hornes like a Lambe, but speaketh as a Dragon.* Apoc. 13. 11. Poore seduced people that feed your selves with shewes of good, wherewith they hide the falshood which they give you, without inquiring of the truth, so easie to be found in the Word of God to confound your Doctors. Aske them but where it is commanded in the Word of God to deprive Lay men and women from the Communion of the Cup, as they doe; and ye shal make them as dumb as fishes.

Those red Hats, and fur'd Hoods, assembled at the Councels of *Constance* and *Trente*, acknowledge in the thirteenth and fifth Sessions

of

of the ſaid Councels, That Chriſt did inſtitute the Sacrament of the Supper under both kinds of bread and wine, and delivered it ſo to his Diciples : Confeſſing moreover that the uſe of both kindes was very frequent and ordin ry in the b ginning of Chriſtian Religion; and yet neverthelesſe, they are ſo bold and impudent as to put an *Anathema* upon him that ſhall ſay that all and every one of the Faithfull ought to receive under both kindes the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, by the commandement of God. Declaring that this cuſtome of receiving under one kinde, ought to be held as a Law : forbidding every Chriſtian to beleeve or teach otherwiſe. Behold how theſe Doctors have banded themſelves openly againſt Chriſt, whom they have Anathematiſed with the Apoſtle Saint

Paul. Our Lord, for ſaying unto his Diſciples when he gave them the Cup, *Drinke yee all of it:* Math. 26. 27. And the Apoſtle, for commanding to every one of the Corinthians, *to examine himſelfe, and ſo eate of this bread and drinke of this cup.* 1. Corinth. 11. 28.

Now, becauſe this is ſufficient to make it appeare that the Pope is contrary unto Chriſt, they labour to put off this blow, alledging that Chriſt ſpake to none but to his Apoſtles, which were paſtours; and ſo, that this priviledge of receiving under both kindes, belongs to Prieſts onely, and not to Lay men; but they cannot ſhun it ſo; for if Chriſt command all his Diſciples to doe that which he had done in the ſupper: It followeth that all his Diſciples indifferently ought to communicate under

der both kinds, but the firſt is true, *doe* (ſaith he) *this in remembrance of me.* 1. Cor. 11. 24. Therefore the laſt alſo.

And ſeeing that the Jeſuites at this day, beſides the Conſequences drawne out of the Word of God, doe aske of us ſtill ſome expreſſe Texts and Arguments whereof the two firſt propoſitions be in the Scriptures: Here be ſome.

Whoſoever bids every man to examine himſelfe, and ſo eate of this Bread and drink of this Cup: commandeth all the Faithfull indifferently to communicate under both kinds.

But Saint Paul *commandeth every one to examine himſelfe, and ſo eate of this Bread, and drink of this Cup,* 1. Cor. 11. 28. *Therefore he commandeth al the Faithful, indifferently to communicate under both kinds.*

Again, *Whoſoever ſaith in the Sa-*

crament of the Lords Supper, Drink yee all of it : biddeth every one to drinke of this Cup, 1. Cor. 11. 28.

But Christ in the Sacrament of the Eucharist saith, Drink yee all of it. Math. 26. 27.

Therefore he commandeth every one to drink of this Cup, 1. Cor. 11.

Behold some expresse texts and cõsequences drawn out of the pure Word of God, for the proofe of our Doctrine, and condemnation of that of our Adversaries.

Our Adversaries on their part, produce some places, by which they pretend to prove, that Christ and the Apostles have given the Communion under the *species* of Bread onely.

First they produce a place out of Saint *Luke*, who saith, That in *Emaus, as Christ sate at meat with the two Disciples, He took Bread, and blessed it, and brake, and gave to them,*

them; and that there is no mention made that he gave them the Cup. *Luke* 24.

Moreover they bring in two other places in the Acts of the Apoſtles, whereof the firſt ſaith, That *The Diſciples did continue in the Apoſtles doctrine, and in the communion and breaking of bread*; and the other, That *the Diſciples were gathered together to break bread.* Acts 2. 42. and chap. 20. 7. From which places they doe inferre, That it is in the power of the Church to take away the Cup from the Lay people: ſince in theſe places there is no mention made of the Cup, but of the bread onely.

To which I anſwer, 1. That I have already brought expreſſe texts out of the Word of God, whereby it is expreſly commanded to all Chriſtians to drinke of

the cup in the Sacrament of the Lords Supper: and therefore that it is not in the Churches power to take away the cup from the Lay people.

2. It is a manifeſt impiety to make uſe of the Word of God for to oppoſe and contradict the ſame word, pulling for that purpoſe ſome texts as it were by the haire and againſt their true meaning, to eſtabliſh a doctrine contrary unto expreſſe textes: which is an ordinary thing with theſe Romiſh Doctors, as appeareth here in this place, where they oppoſe the texts here above mentioned, to theſe two expreſſe and plaine texts. *Drinke yee all of it.* Math. 26. *Let every man examine himſelfe, and ſo let him drink of this cup.* 1. Cor. 11. 3.

That even from theſe places produced by them, no man can inferre

ferre that it is in the power of the Church to take away the Cup from the people. 1. For in that of Saint *Lukes*, it is not ſpoken of the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, but of a common repaſt, at which it was Chriſts accuſtomed manner to breake the bread with giving of thanks, as you may ſee in Saint *Math.* 14. 19. and in S. *Luke* 9. 16.

2. That though the Sacrament of the Euchariſt were meant in theſe places, it were no good conſequence to ſay: *In theſe places there is no mention made, but of breaking of bread: Therefore there was no wine:* For under the word *Bread*, the Scripture ſignifieth all things neceſſary for life, as you may ſee in theſe places of the Word of God. *Gen.* 37. 35. and chap. 43. 31. 32. 34. And though I ſay I did eate with ſuch a one, It doth not

not follow that I dranke not with him.

3. That if in theſe places the Sacrament of the Lords ſupper be meant, and there was no wine at it: It followeth that neither Chriſt nor the Apoſtles dranke at it, and conſequently that Prieſts are no more bound than the Lay people to communicate under both kindes. But *de Raconis* denyeth it in a Treatiſe he made upon the converſion of *Monſieur de Colincourt*, page 87. ſaying, That *the Apoſtles were bound to celebrate under both kindes of bread and wine ſeverally, to repreſent the ſeparation that was made on the Croſſe of the blood of Chriſt from his body.*

Now for to prove their Tranſubſtantiation, theſe Doctors produce ſome places out of the ſixt of Saint *John*, where there is never a word ſpoken of the Euchariſt,

riſt, but of Chriſts fleſh given upon the Croſſe for the life of the World; not perceiving that by this meanes they even overthrow themſelves. For here are Chriſts words, *Except you eate the fleſh of the Sonne of man, and drinke his blood, yee have no life in you. Whoſoever eateth my fleſh and drinketh my blood, hath eternall life.* John 6. 53. 54. If theſe words be meant of the Euchariſt: It followeth they deprive the people of life, taking from them the Cup.

Moreover, it is not enough to eate the fleſh of Chriſt by faith under the ſigne of bread, but we muſt alſo drinke his blood ſpiritually by faith under the ſigne of the wine, ſeeing Chriſt hath inſtituted this holy Sacrament under both ſignes of bread and wine; the one to be broken, and the other to be ſhed or powred forth

in

in remembrance of him: the which he chiefly recommended of the Cup, saying, *Drinke yee all of it.* Math. 26: and even as if he would have remedied the error that afterwards crept into the Church; *viz.* in taking away against his precept, the halfe of that holy sacrament. And therefore it is to no purpose to alledge the concomitancie. For, to eate a morsell of bread in forme of a Wafer, is not to drinke Christs blood as hee biddeth it expresly, saying, That *Except we drinke his blood, we have no life in us.* John 6.

CHAP.

CHAP. XII.

That the pretended Sacrifice of the Maſſe was onely eſtabliſhed for to annihilate the power and efficacy of the Sacrifice of the Croſſe. And that there is but one onely Sacrificator ſacrificing expiatorily in the Evangelicall Law, to wit, Jeſus Chriſt our Lord.

BRiefly, whoſever ſhall conſider the Popes Doctrine, and of his Diſciples, he ſhall ſee plainly, That it tendeth onely to debaſe the merit and vertue of the death and paſſion of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt: as you may obſerve by the Doctrine of their pretended ſacrifice of the Maſſe. For theſe Doctors teach, that it is a ſecond ſacrifice of Chriſt, propitiatory both for the quicke and for the dead,

dead; which is plainly to deny that the Sacrifice of the Croſſe hath the power and efficacy to take away ſinnes, unleſſe it be reiterated. But the Apoſtle Saint *Paul* teacheth us plainly, that the ſacrifice of the Croſſe, hath at once taken ſin wholly away, when he ſaith, That *by the wil of God we are ſanctified through the offering of the body of Jeſus Chriſt once for all. By one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are ſanctified.* And he addeth yet another ſentence, that cutteth up this Error by the very roots. Now, *Where remiſſion of theſe is, there is no more offering for ſin*, Heb. 10. 10. 14. 18. He meaneth by theſe things, the tranſgreſſion of the Law of God. But in the Sacrifice of the Croſſe there is forgiveneſſe of theſe things: Therefore there is no more oblation for ſinne.

Againſt

Againſt ſuch cleare places, theſe Doctors arme themſelves with a falſe diſtinction of Sacrifice, which they could never yet prove, neither out of any expreſſe text taken out of the Word of God, or neceſſary Conſequence drawn out of the ſame. They ſay, that there is no more bloody ſacrifice for ſin; but that there is an unbloody ſacrifice, according to the order of *Melchiſedeck*, for the continuall application of the merit of the ſacrifice of the Croſſe.

But this diſtinction is not able to take them off the hooks. For, the Apoſtle ſaying expreſſely, That there is no more oblation for ſin, ſheweth us plainly, That there is no other propitiatory ſacrifice for ſinne, of what kind ſoever, but that of the Croſſe. It is therefore their part, that goe about to give the Apoſtle the lye, to prove that

that distinction, shewing by expresse texts, or at least by necessary consequences drawne out of the pure Word of God, that we ought to sacrifice againe the body of Christ unbloodily, to apply the merit of his bloody sacrifice: which thing they are never able to doe.

For to attaine to this proofe, some of them argue thus: Christ is a sacrificator after the order of *Melchisedeck*; but *Melchisedeck* offered an unbloody sacrifice: for he offered bread and wine. Therefore Christ after the same order, hath offered an unbloody sacrifice, when he hath offered himselfe under the *Species* of bread and wine. And therefore the distinction of bloody and unbloody sacrifice is true.

We grant the *Major*, but wee deny the *Minor*, which is grounded

ded upon a falſhood. Wee doe not finde in any place of holy Scripture, that *Melchiſedeck* offered to God bread and wine. Wee reade in the 14 of *Genejis*, verſ. 18. that he brought unto *Abraham* bread and wine for to feede and refreſh him and his men that were wearied and travayl'd as they came from the defeat of the Kings: But there is not a word there that *Melchiſedeck* offered bread and wine unto God. And therefore the concluſion of this argument is falſe, and by conſequent alſo this pretended diſtinction of bloody and unbloody ſacrifice.

Now I will ſhew hereafter wherin conſiſts this order of *Melchiſedeck*, according to which order Chriſt is an everlaſting Sacrificator. At this preſent, I will preſſe our Adverſaries upon this pretended application, which is

the laſt refuge of falſhood brought to the baye upon her back.

We ſay then that in this pretended application, our Adverſaries grant under hand tacitely, that the Maſſe is not the ſacrifice of Jeſus Chriſt. For, if it be but the application of Chriſts ſacrifice: It followeth it is not Chriſts ſacrifice. For even as the application of a plaſter is not a plaſter; ſo the application of Chriſts ſacrifice, is not Chriſts ſacrifice.

And here theſe Doctors confeſſe freely againe that the Maſſe is not Chriſts ſacrifice. For they ſay that every true ſacrifice requireth that the thing offered be deſtroyed and conſumed: Whereupon we build this argument.

Every true ſacrifice requireth that the thing offered be deſtroyed and conſumed. But the Maſſe, ſay they, is a true ſacrifice: Therefore

fore the thing offered in the Maſſe, is deſtroyed and conſumed.

They yeeld us that too, but to their confuſion; for ſay we,

If the thing offered in the Maſſe, be deſtroyed and conſumed, and this thing offered is the body of Chriſt: It followeth that the body of Chriſt is deſtroyed and conſumed in the Maſſe. It is not true, ſay they, but it is the *Species* of bread and wine that are deſtroyed and conſumed: that is, the color, the taſte, the roundneſſe and quantity of the bread and wine. They confeſſe therefore freely that the Maſſe is not Chriſts ſacrifice, ſeeing that he is not deſtroyed, but onely a ſacrifice of roundneſſes, of meaſures, of lines, of caſtles in the ayre, well befitting ſuch a Religion, wherein all is nothing but Maske and hypocriſie.

Moreover, the application of

a thing, is not the thing applyed. As for example, The water of the Bath is applyed by meanes of the channel or conduit-pipe: Yet it is not the pipe. Phyſicke is adminiſtred with a cup or veſſel, but it is not the veſſel: and ſo of all other things. But contrariwiſe, theſe ſuttle Doctors will have the application and the thing applyed to be one and the ſelfe ſame thing. For they ſay that Chriſts ſacrifice is applyed by the ſacrifice of the ſame Chriſt. But they have not cunning enough yet to perſwade us that although the Maſſe were good, it could be both the Phyſicke and the veſſel together.

But, ſay our Adverſaries, doe we an injury to the phyſick by applying it with the veſſell? doe we wrong to the water of the Bath, when we receive it by the channel? doe

doe we wrong to the bloody ſacrifice, in applying it by the unbloody ſacrifice?

Yea Doctors, ye doe wrong to the Phyſick, when ye attribute unto the veſſel the vertue of healing, which is onely proper to the phyſicke. Ye doe wrong to the water of the Bath, when ye attribute unto the conduit-pipe the cure which the water onely worketh. Likewiſe ye doe wrong to the ſacrifice of the Croſſe, when yee attribute to your pretended ſacrifice of the Maſſe the vertue to expiate ſinnes, as if the other alone were inſufficient.

Wee hold therefore, that Chriſt cannot bee offered againe in ſacrifice for the forgiveneſſe of ſinnes, without making voyde the vertue and efficacy of the ſacrifice of the Croſſe. For of two plaſters, either the one

is ſufficient to heale the wound, or both are requiſite and neceſſary. If the one be ſufficient, the other is ſuperfluous. If both are requiſite and neceſſary : it followeth that one is not ſufficient. Let us ſay then, if there be two propitiatory ſacrifices for the remiſſion of ſinnes, the one bloody, and the other unbloody: The one of the two is ſufficient, or both are requiſite and neceſſary. If the one be ſufficient, the other is ſuperfluous. If both are requiſite and neceſſary: It followes that one alone is inſufficient. So that admitting two propitiatory ſacrifices, the one bloody, the other unbloody, is to deny that the ſacrifice of the Croſſe hath the vertue alone to expiate ſins.

The Word of God doth not teach us that there is two different ſacrifices of Chriſt, the one bloody

the other unbloody. The Apoſtle to the *Hebrewes* imployeth many leafes to declare this point, and treating fully of the Prieſthood in the Chriſtian Church, he there makes no mention at all of the Sacrament of the Lords Supper.

Finally, our Adverſaries affirme that the Maſſe is an unbloody propitiatory ſacrifice inſtituted by Chriſt, both for the quick and for the dead. Enquired where he inſtituted it: they bring theſe words, *Doe this*. Admirable proofe! *Doe this*, that is to ſay, ſacrifice me really under the kindes of bread and wine in propitiatory ſacrifice both for the quicke and for the dead. That is a good gloſſe. But by theſe words *Doe this*, Chriſt commandeth to doe that which he did at the Supper. Therefore they ſhould have prooved firſt that

Christ did at the Lords Supper sacrifice himselfe to God his Father, which he did not doe. Nevertheless, some of them doe go about to prove it, alleadging the words which our Lord saith in Saint *Luke*, *This is my body which is given for you.* Luke 22. 19. Where given, say they? not on the Crosse: for he was not yet there; but under the *Species* of bread and wine at the same instant, and even while he pronounced these words: Whereupon they conclude that Christ offered himself to God his Father at the supper.

I answer, that these words *which is given for you, &c.* prove no manner of way that Christ offered himselfe to God his Father in the sacrament. For he offered onely to his Disciples, saying unto them *Take.* But he offereth nothing to God, he maketh no Elevation of

an

an Hoſte. Moreover, Adoration is a neceſſary action in all Sacrifices: but the Apoſtles worſhipped not the bread which Chriſt gave unto them, but remained at table with him: which ſheweth, they did not think that bread to be tranſubſtantiated into the body of Chriſt. For otherwiſe, it had been an extreame irreverence in them not to worſhip that which Chriſt did preſent unto them.

And for that he ſaith in the Preſent tenſe, *which is given for you, &c.* we ſee he ſpeaketh often of his approaching death, as if it were preſent; *I lay down*, ſaith he, *my life for my ſheep*, John 10. 15. 17. 18. *I leave my life that I may take it again. Father, I have finiſhed the work which thou gaveſt me to doe*, John 17. 4. Nevertheleſſe, there remained the principall thing, to wit, his death upon the Croſſe.

The

The Lambe was ſlain from the foundation of the World, Apoc. 13. 8. *I ſend you* (ſaith God by the Prophet *Malachy*) *the Prophet* Eliah, Mal. 4. 3. that is, I will ſend you *John* the *Baptiſt*; which was not done of a long time after. If therefore a thing ſo farre off, was ſaid as if it were preſent: how much more ſhall that be thought preſent, which is to be done at hand? There is nothing ſo frequent in the word of God as the changing of tenſes: So as very often, the Paſt, or the Preſent, is taken for the future. Thus Chriſt ſpeaketh of the Sacrifice of the Croſſe, on which he gave himſelf for the life of the World.

Some others argue thus; All effuſion of blood for the Remiſſion of ſinnes, is a propitiatory Sacrifice: But Chriſt ſaith that his blood is ſhed in the Euchariſt for

the

the Remiſſion of ſinnes : Therefore the Euchariſt is a propitiatory Sacrifice.

I anſwer, That the two firſt propoſitions of this Argument are falſe, as alſo the concluſion, in the ſence that our Adverſaries take it in. Firſt, it is falſe that an effuſion of blood is a propitiatory Sacrifice for the Remiſſion of ſinnes : Unleſſe that blood be offered unto God with the death of the Sacrifice. But Chriſt offered nothing unto God in the Euchariſt, nor yet ſuffered death thereat.

Again, It is falſe that Chriſt did ſhed his blood in the Euchariſt. For it was not ſhed, but on the Croſſe : and it is of that ſhedding he ſpeaketh, ſaying, *This Cup is the New Teſtament in my blood, which is ſhed for you.* And to reply that there is in the preſent tenſe, *is ſhed*, and not in the future *ſhal be ſhed* :

ſhed: is to no purpoſe. For I have above ſtopt this paſſage, in ſhewing out of divers places of the holy Scriptures, that this word, *is*, is oftentimes taken in the Future. And indeed, the Latine Bible of the *Roman* Church, and the Canon of the Maſſe, turnes it in the Future, *qui pro vobis effundetur, which ſhall be ſhed for you.*

But it is worthy of Note, to ſee how our Adverſaries grant without difficulty, that which they ſo painfully deny. For when we aske of them, whether Chriſts blood came out of the veins in the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, or no? They anſwer, It did not come out of the veins. Then it was not ſhed there, ſay we. For a thing is not ſhed while it remaineth incloſed in the veſſell that containeth it. And beſides, they call the Maſſe an unbloody Sacrifice. Nevertheleſſe, con-

contradicting themſelves groſſely, they will not give over writing and affirming that Chriſt ſhed his blood there. We aske them then, how, and after what manner it is ſhed in the Maſſe. They anſwer, It is ſhed under the *ſpecies* of the wine. Then, ſay we, It is ſhed. It is not, ſay they; It is but the accidents of the wine onely that are ſhed. Now I leave it to the judgment of all men, whether this be not with one breath to deny and affirme both together: Why then do they tell us that it is ſhed, for to tell us preſently after that it is not ſhed, but that the onely accidents of wine are ſhed? They have bin brought to lay the like abſurdity upon theſe words, *which is broken for you*, being forced to maintain that the body of Chriſt is broken, becauſe the *ſpecies* that cõtain him, are broken. The concluſion which

they

they draw from this argument, is alſo falſe. For they conclude, that the Euchariſt is a propitiatory Sacrifice for ſin, both for the quick and for the dead: which is not ſo, but onely a Sacrifice of thankſgiving: for there is but one propitiatory Sacrifice for ſinne, which is that of the Croſſe.

Now, even as there is but one onely expiatory Sacrifice, ſo there is but one onely Prieſt ſacrificing expiatorily, to wit, Chriſt Jeſus our Lord. There were many under the Law, becauſe they were hindered by death from remaining: but our Lord Jeſus Chriſt remaining a Prieſt for ever, and which cannot be hindered by death, needeth no other Prieſt to be appointed in his roome.

And it is here that theſe new ſacrificers labour in vain to prove their pretended calling: For it is

an

an imaginary charge, which was never eſtabliſhed by Chriſt, nor practiſed by the Apoſtles. Behold how they argue.

Chriſt ſaid to his Diſciples, *As my Father hath ſent me, ſo I ſend you.* But Chriſt was ſent of the Father to ſacrifice under the kindes of bread and wine, after the order of *Melchiſedeck*. Therefore he ſent his Apoſtles to ſacrifice under the *ſpecies* of bread and wine according to this order; and Conſequently, hath made them Prieſts.

I anſwer, That if it be falſe that *Melchiſedeck* did ſacrifice bread and wine: It followeth, it is as falſe that Chriſt ſent his Apoſtles to ſacrifice him under the kinds of bread and wine: but the firſt is true. I have proved it already plainely here above: therefore the laſt alſo.

But to make the Error of this allegation appear the more plainly,

ly, we must but adde this to the second proposition of their Argument. As Christ was sent of his Father, so he sent his Apostles. But Christ was sent of his Father to be a King, a Prophet, and for to sacrifice himself for the Redemption of many. Therefore he sent his Apostles to be Kings, prophets, and to sacrifice themselves for the Redemption of many. Who sees not the error and falshood of such a proposition? This word, *As*, therfore, must not be understood of the Kingly, or Propheticall Office, and Priesthood of Christ. It is a presumption and temerity for men to assume unto themselves such titles: but onely for the preaching of the Gospel, administring of Sacraments, and things which onely regard the Ministery. Christ gave them not any other Office.

Ard

And as touching the Order of *Melchiſedeck*, after which Chriſt is a Prieſt for ever: It is not in regard of the ſacrifices, but in regard of the perſons ſacrificing. The Apoſtle teacheth it plainly, handling the compariſon between Chriſt and *Melchiſedeck*. In the firſt place, he ſaith, *Heb.* 7. 2. That Melchiſedeck *is by Interpretation, King of Righteouſneſſe*, and alſo, *King of Peace*: which are titles belonging to Chriſt, and which the Prophets alſo give him. For he is King of Righteouſneſſe, becauſe he abſolves and Juſtifies us by his obedience before God his Father. He is alſo King of Peace, becauſe that making our peace and reconciliation, he directeth us into the way of everlaſting peace. The Apoſtle goes on, and ſaith, That *this* Melchiſedeck *was without Father, without Mother, and without*

deſcent, having neither beginning of daies, nor end of life: but being made like unto the Sonne of God, abideth a Prieſt for ever. Behold then wherin conſiſteth the agreement and ſimilitude between our Lord Jeſus Chriſt and *Melchiſedeck*, which is not in the matter of the thing ſacrificed, but in the Order and Calling of the perſons ſacrificing: which is proved again plainely in this, that Chriſt is a Prieſt for ever after that Order of *Melchiſedeck*. For if this Order were and did conſiſt in the pretended ſacrfice of the Maſſe: Then it would follow, that Chriſt ſhould not be a Prieſt for ever, ſeeing the Maſſe ſhall not endure for ever.

Therefore, Even as the ſame *Melchiſedeck* was not head of any Order of Prieſthood, but onely a Prieſt after his own Order under the Law: So Chriſt the onely

Prieſt

Prieſt under the Evangelical Law, needeth not to have a company of Prieſts ſacrificing expiatorily; and therefore that infinite number of Sacrificers eſtabliſhed in the Church of Rome for to ſacrifice againe our Lord Jeſus Chriſt to God his Father, ſtandes convinced of having no calling. Seeing they have intruded themſelves into that Office without any commandment from God, taking nuto themſelves in ſo doing, the honour which belongeth to none but to our Lord and Saviour: it not belonging at all unto the creature to ſacrifice the Creator; or for men ſinners, to ſacrifice the Lambe without ſin.

CHAP. XIII.

*That S.*Peter *was not eſtabliſhed by Chriſt head of the Univerſal Church, and Prince of the Apoſtles, and Conſequently, that the Pope (who challengeth this Title but as S.*Peters *ſucceſſor) hath intruded himſelfe into that office, without any lawfull calling: and ſheweth himſelfe to be Antichriſt, in doing quite contrary to that which Chriſt and S.*Peter *did.*

TO be ſhort, It ſeemeth that our Adverſaries wil be Chriſtians no longer: having not only forſaken the Doctrin, but the very name alſo, for to take the name of Catholicks. God in his Juſtice would not ſuffer that they ſhould retain the name which belongeth onely to true Chriſtians, that follow his word, and truſt in his promiſes. For to be a true Chriſtian,

it

it is not enough to beleeve onely that there is a Chriſt: but we muſt rely on his promiſes, and receive him ſuch as he was given unto us of the Father, that is, for our ſalvation, righteouſneſſe and ſatisfaction for our ſinnes. But our Adverſaries doe not receive him ſo, ſeeing they have eſtabliſhed their righteouſneſſe in their own works, by which they thinke to deſerve the kingdome of God. They will ſay indeed, that his blood ſhed upon the Croſſe is our Purgatory: but they doe eſtabliſh another in an Imaginary fire. They ſay that the ſacrifice he made upon the Croſſe hath taken away our ſinnes: but they have eſtabliſhed another ſacrifice to blot them away againe; and all againſt the Word of God. Therefore they cannot boaſt that they are Chriſtians, but rather Antichriſtians, that have rejected the

true Doctrine, for to embrace and follow the Doctrine of the Pope of Rome, who oppoſeth and exalteth himſelfe above all that is called God, or that is worſhipped: So that he as God, ſitteth in the Temple of God ſhewing himſelfe that he is God, 2. *Theſ.* 2. 4.

But for as much as the Popes Diſciples do cloak this myſtery of iniquity with ſome places of Scripture, wherby they pretend to prove that S. *Peter* was eſtabliſhed Head of the Univerſall Church, and Prince of the Apoſtles; becauſe they would maintaine the Pope, who by cunning hath intruded himſelf into that office: I will ſhew in few words that Saint *Peter* was not Prince of the Apoſtles, nor head of the Univerſall Church, as they ſay.

In the firſt place, the Word of God tels us, That our Lord Jeſus Chriſt

Chriſt is the Head of his Church. *God hath put all things* (ſaith S. *Paul*) *under his feet: and gave him to be the head over all things to the Church, which is his body.* Again, *He is the head of the body, the Church: who is the beginning, the firſt born from the dead: that in all things he might have the preeminence*, Epheſ. 1. 22. 23. Coloſ. 1. 18. By theſe places it appeares, that S. *Peter* was not Head of the Church; For Shee which is but one body, cannot have two heads. And it is to no purpoſe to ſay that Chriſt is the eſſential head, but that S. *Peter* was the Miniſteriall head: For it is ſtill to make a monſter of the Church, in giving her two heads.

Moreover, if S. *Peter* was miniſteriall head of the Church, and Prince of the Apoſtles, It muſt be by the inſtitution of Chriſt: and if it be by Chriſts inſtitution, this

inſtitution is to be found in the word of God. Moreover, S. *Peter* muſt needs have exerciſed that office, or elſe it would have brought a confuſion in the Church. But on the contrary, the word of God, ſheweth us, That Chriſt did not appoint *Peter* to bee head of the Church, nor Prince of the Apoſtles. *Item*, That S. *Peter* did never exerciſe that office, as I ſhall prove by theſe texts and reaſons following.

As for the firſt point, S. *Paul* teacheth us, That *our Lord for the gathering of the Saints, for the work of the Miniſtery, and for the edification of his body, hath given ſome Apoſtles, and ſome Prophets, and ſome Paſtors and Teachers*, Epheſ. 4. 11. And in another place: *God hath ſet ſome in the Church: Firſt Apoſtles, ſecondly Prophets, thirdly Teachers*, 1. Cor. 12, 28. He maketh no mention at all

all of any head of the Church, nor of Prince of the Apoſtles: and yet theſe are the places where this principality ſhould have appeared, being very likely that if Chriſt had eſtabliſhed *Peter* for head of the Univerſall Church, and Prince of the Apoſtles; he would not have omitted to ſet down this principality in the firſt ranke. But having left it out, it appeareth, That Chriſt did not ordaine any one for head of the Church, and Prince of the Apoſtles.

But let us learn of S. *Peter* himſelfe whether there ſhould be in the Church a Prince among the Apoſtles or no. *I exhort* (ſaith he, he doth not ſay, I command) *the Elders that are among you; I that am an Elder with you* (he doth not ſay above them) *and a witneſſe of the ſufferings of Chriſt. Feed the flocke of God which is among you, taking*

the

the overſight thereof, not by conſtraint, but willingly: not for filthy lucre, but of a ready minde; neither as being Lords (marke, as being Lords) *over Gods heritage: but being enſamples to the Flocke*, 1.Pet.5.1.2.3. S.*Peter* therefore did not beleeve that any Biſhop ſhould be Prince among the Apoſtles, and have ſpeciall lordſhip in the Church, as the Pope and his diſciples do ſuppoſe.

Upon the ſtrife which aroſe twice among the Apoſtles about primacy, Chriſt decided their controverſie, ſaying unto them, *ye know that the Princes of the Gentiles exerciſe dominion over them, and they that are great, exerciſe authority upon them; Bus it ſhall not be ſo among you*, Mat.20.25.26.

The word of God alſo in divers places recommendeth humility unto us: to become as little children, to be poore. Chriſt propoſeth

ſeth himſelfe for an example thereof unto his Apoſtles: and will have his Apoſtles to be for an example unto all the World. That *the ſon of man* (ſaith he) *is not come to be miniſtred unto, but to miniſter*, Mat. 18. 1. 2. 3. and chap. 20. 28.

When the Apoſtles were ſent to preach, they were ſent as fellows: the which excludeth ſuperiority, *Math.* 10.

Moreover, Chriſt promiſeth unto them, *That they ſhall ſit upon twelve Thrones, Judging the twelve Tribes of Iſrael*, Luk. 22. 30. But he giveth not unto *Peter* a more eminent place for to preſide, than to the reſt.

When the holy Ghoſt deſcended upon them, It was when they were all in one place, and without any prerogative, *Acts* 2. 1. 4.

S. *Paul* ſaith, That *there is no difference between him and them who ſeemed*

med to be moſt eminent, Galat. 2. 6. He did not then acknowledge any of the Apoſtles to be above him, as head of the Univerſall Church and Prince of the Apoſtles.

Again, he ſaith, That *the Goſpel of the Uncircumciſion was committed unto him, as the Goſpel of the Circumciſion was unto* Peter, Galat. 2. 7. Behold then, they are equall in the labor and miniſtery of the Goſpel.

The Apoſtles that were at Jeruſalem, hearing that *Samaria* had received the word of God: they ſent them *Peter* and *John*, *Acts* 8. 14. Now, to be ſent, ſhewes no ſuperiority; but, at moſt, equality of them that ſendeth and of him that is ſent. For the inferiour never ſendeth the ſuperiour. I doe verily beleeve that the Pope would not approve of them that ſhould ſend him to preach in *England*.

S. *Peter* was rebuked by S. *Paul*, who

who withſtood him to the face. The which hee doth after ſuch a manner, as he ſhewes well enough that he did not eſteem him as head of the Church, nor Prince of the Apoſtles, *Gal.* 2. 11. 14.

It appears therefore by theſe places that S. *Peter* was not head of the Univerſall Church, nor Prince of the Apoſtles. It remains now to ſee whether he did exerciſe that place: and whether the reſt of the Apoſtles have yeelded him the preheminence.

At the Councell of *Jeruſalem*, S. *Peter* propounded his opinion; but *James*, Biſhop of the ſame place made the concluſion as Preſident thereof, *Acts* 15. 7. 13. 19. and the Letters were not diſpatched in *Peters* name, but in the name of the whole Aſſembly: Nevertheleſſe, this was the place where S. *Peter* ſhould have exerciſed this office

of

of Head and Prince among the Apoſtles.

Item, He is accuſed by the Diſciples for converſing with the *Gentiles*. He maketh his defence and excuſe, *Act*.11. He was then accountable to his brethren for what he did.

In ſumme, He calleth himſelfe a fellow Elder with the Elders of the Church, and exhorteth them lovingly as his equals, 1.*Pet*.5.1. Therefore he did not think himſelf Head and Prince amongſt them.

But let us heare a pleaſant objection which the Popes diſciples do make for to prove that S.*Peter* was Head and Prince of the Apoſtles. S.*Peter*, ſay they, is the firſt named in the Scripture. He was the firſt whoſe feet Chriſt did waſh; The firſt that ſpake at the Councell of *Jeruſalem*; The firſt after Chriſt to whom the Angels did ſpeak: all which

which prerogatives doe ſhew, that he was Head and Prince of the Apoſtles.

This Argument deſerves not an anſwer. For if the firſt-named in the holy Scriptures, is for that cauſe the ſuperiour: the laſt named ſhall be the leaſt and the abjecteſt. Now, if that be true: *Chriſt* and *Peter* ſhall ſit in the loweſt ranke in the Church. For *Chriſt* himſelfe is poſtpoſed to S. *Peter* by S. *Paul*. *Now, this I ſay, that every one of you ſaith, I am of* Paul, *and I of* Apollo, *and I of* Cephas, *and I of* Chriſt, 1. Cor. 1. 12. S. *John* alſo names *Peter* the laſt; *Philip*, ſaith he, *was of* Bethſaida *the City of* Andrew *and* Peter, *John* 1. 44. S. *Paul* alſo placeth S. *James* before; *James, Cephas*, and *John who ſeemed to be pillars*, Galat. 2. 9. Therefore this is but a meere foppery, brought in a deſperate cauſe for lacke of better reaſons.

ſons. S. *Peter* might be among the Apoſtles, the firſt in age or in zeale, or in eloquence, or in vertue and miracles; but not at all in principality and ſuperiority of juriſdiction.

Moreover, they alledge againe, That *Chriſt* ſaid to *Peter*, *Thou art* Peter, *and upon this rocke will I build my Church.* Therefore, ſay they, *Peter* was eſtabliſhed the head and foundation of the Church.

I anſwer, That *Chriſt* did not build upon the perſon of *Peter*, but upon himſelfe, and upon the confeſſion of Faith which *Peter* had made: and therefore this concluſion, That S. *Peter* is head and foundation of the Church is falſe. *For other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid*, ſaith S. *Paul*, 1. Cor. 3. 11. But this foundation which is laid is *Chriſt Jeſus*: Therefore no man can lay any other foundation than *Chriſt Jeſus*. Again,

Againe, Chriſt hath plainely diſtinguiſhed *Peter* from the *Rock*, that is, *Simon Peter* from the *living Rocke* upon which is builded the Church. For he ſaith not *ſuper te Petrum*, but *Super hanc petram*, that is to ſay, *upon this Rocke*, and not *upon thee Peter*.

Moreover, let every one judge whether it is more convenient the Church ſhould be grounded upon *Peter* than upon Chriſt: upon the Son of the living God whom *Peter* had confeſſed: or upon *Peter*, who preſently after denied the Son of the living God: upon him who hath vanquiſhed Satan, or upon him whom Chriſt calleth Satan. *Mat.* 16. 23. Upon him who is called the chiefe corner ſtone; or upon him who was a ſcandal, that is to ſay, a ſtumbling ſtone.

Againe, the Popes Diſciples alledge that Chriſt ſaid thrice to

Peter, Feed my ſheep. But there is great difference betwixt feeding Chriſts ſheep, and to be Univerſal Head of the Church, and Prince of the Apoſtles. Chriſt ſaith not to him, feed my ſheep univerſally or ſoveraignly: the ſame commiſſion of feeding the ſheep is given to all the Apoſtles. *The holy Ghoſt*, ſaith Saint *Paul, hath eſtabliſhed you Biſhops, to feed the Church of God, whom he hath purchaſed with his owne blood.* Act. 20.28. *Feed the flock of Chriſt which is committed unto you*, ſaith S. *Peter*. 1.Pet.5.21.

Chriſt ſpeaketh unto *Peter* onely, and biddeth him three times feed his ſheep, becauſe he had denyed him thrice. Chriſt draweth three confeſſions from him, to remedy his threefold denying: at the end of which he is reeſtabliſhed in the office of a Paſtor.

Therefore this being prooved, that

that Saint *Peter* was not head of the Church, nor Prince of the Apoſtles: It followeth that the Pope (who challengeth it but as his Succeſſor) hath intruded himſelf into that office, without any lawfull calling: and maintaineth himſelfe therein by tyranny, doing and practiſing that which neither Chriſt nor *Peter* ever did or practiſed.

1. For neither Chriſt nor *Peter* ever ſhewed themſelves in *Pontificalibus*, crown'd with three crowns: nor cauſed the Kings of the earth to kiſſe their feet, as the Pope doth at this day, having changed the Chriſtian Religion into Idolatry, ſuperſtition and falſe doctrines, contrary unto the Word of God.

2. Saint *Peter* never exalted himſelfe above men and Angels, as the Pope doth in that he willeth and commandeth all men to worſhip him; and the Angel refuſed it, ſay-

ing to *John* that would have worshipped him, *See thou doe it not, I am a servant with thee, worship God.* Apoc.22.9. Saint *Peter* likewise made *Cornelius* the Centurion to arise, saying unto him, That *he himselfe was a man.* Acts 10. 16.

3. Saint *Peter* never bragged that he had all power both in heaven and in earth, as the Pope doth. *Item*, he never gave away the kingdomes of the World, nor (for that end) dispensed with any Subjects for their oath of allegiance.

4. Saint *Peter* never caused himselfe to be called God, as the Pope doth: *Can. satisf. distinct. 96.* nor said that he was neither God nor man, but somewhat betwixt the Divinity and the Humanity, as saith *the Glosse upon the Clementines*, and never made himselfe to be called most holy Father.

5. Saint

5. Saint *Peter* never ſtiled himſelfe the Spouſe of the Church, The Prince of the Apoſtles, the Univerſall Monarch, the Soveraigne Paſtor, the Lyon of Juda, the Saviour of the Church, as the Pope doth, *Councell of Lateran Seſſion. 6.* Who in ſo doing, taketh upon him thoſe titles which belong onely unto Chriſt.

6. The Councell of *Florence* ſaith, That the Pope may add to the Symbole of the Apoſtles; which is as much in effect as to account and acknowledge him to be God. For none but God alone can add to the Symbole, And make Articles of Faith in his Church to bind the conſciences of men.

Upon this objection, *De Raconis* maketh a pleaſant anſwer to *Peter* du *Moulin*; *That which you produce* (ſaith hee in his triumph

of truth, page 127.) *of the Councell of Florence, that the Pope may add to the Apoſtles Creed: avayleth nothing. The meaning of it, is only that he may (whether in a Councell or out of a Councell)eſtabliſh Articles of Faith : But not that hee will place them as thirteenth, fourteenth, or fifteenth Articles of the Apoſtles Creed.*

This Doctor being ſmitten on his viſible head, was ſo amazed with the blow, that he knew not what he wrote. Maſter du *Moulin* tels him that the Councell of *Florence* ſaith, that the Pope may add to the Apoſtles Creed. Thereupon hee anſwereth that the onely meaning is, that the Pope may make Articles of Faith. Is not that well anſwered ? Doubtleſſe, if the Pope may add to the Symbole, hee may make Articles of Faith. Therefore he ſhould have proved

proved firſt that the Pope may add to the Creed, and then it had been time for him to tell that he may make Articles of Faith. But who hath told him that the onely meaning is, that the Pope may make Articles of Faith? What audacioufneſſe is it in this Doctor ſo to reſtraine and wreſt the words of this Councell, which ſaith in expreſſe tearmes that the Pope may add to the Creed?

Mark therefore that *De Racoñis* doth not ſay that the Pope may not add to the Creed: but, that the Articles of faith which he may make, he will not place them as thirteenth, fourteenth, or fifteenth Articles of the Creed. I anſwer, it matters not: ſince the Pope will have whatſoever he ſaith and decreeth in matters of Religion, to be received with like credit, authority and certainty, as the Articles of the Creed.

Moreover, I deny that the Pope may add to the Creed, and make Articles of Faith. And it is *De Raconis* part and the reſt of the Doctors of the *Roman* Church, to prove it by expreſſe texts of the Word of God, or by neceſſary conſequences drawne out of the ſame. For lack of which, I maintain that this alone is ſufficient to prove that the Pope is Antichriſt, ſince he takes upon him that power which belongeth onely to God, which is to be able to add to the Creed, and make Articles of Faith to bind the conſciences of men.

In a word, if the Pope be wholly contrary to our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, both in doctrine and in manners: It followes hee is that Antichriſt ſpoken of in the Word of God; ſince to be Antichriſt, is nothing elſe but to be contrary to Chriſt. But the antecedent is true; I have proved

proved it already here above as touching the doctrine. It is as easie also to prove it touching manners.

1. First, our Lord Jesus Christ shewed himselfe so humble, that although he was King both of heaven and earth, yet would he not shew himselfe to be such in this World. He fled unto a Mountaine when the Jewes would have made him King. *John 6.* 15. He saith That *his kingdome is not of this world.* John 18.30. But the Pope exalteth himselfe above the Emperor, and above al Kings & Princes of the earth: Therefore he is contrary unto Christ in his manners.

2. Christs mind did not runne upon heaping up treasures on earth; but his onely care was to do the Wil of God his Father. He testifieth That *the Foxes have holes,*

and

and the birds of the ayre have neſts: but he had not whereon to reſt his head. Mat.8.20. S.*Peter* alſo ſaith, That *he had neither Gold nor Silver*, Act. 3.6. But all the Popes care is to gather up treaſures and riches. Therefore he is contrary unto Chriſt in his Manners.

3. Chriſt, willing to ſhew himſelfe a patterne of humility, waſhed the feet of his Apoſtles, *John* 13. But the Pope will not be ſo officious; but on the contrary, he makes others to kiſſe his feet devoutly, out of his pride. Therfore, he is contrary unto Chriſt in his Manners.

4. Chriſt was Crowned with a Crowne of Thornes: but it pleaſeth his Holineſſe to weare three Crownes that are not of the like matter.

5. Chriſt went into Cities and Townes, preaching, and ſhewing the

the Doctrine of Salvation, *Luk.* 8. But the Pope diſpenſeth with himſelf handſomely from that labour.

6. Chriſt commands his Apoſtles to give for nothing that which they have received for nothing, *Mat.* 10.8. But the Pope is wiſer than ſo, to give any of his wares *gratis*.

7. Chriſt teacheth us, That *if any man will be his Diſciple and follow him, that he muſt take up his Croſſe*, Mat. 10. that is, all manner of afflictions and poverty; denying himſelfe and his affections. But the Pope followes not this precept: and by Conſequent, cannot be put or placed into the number of Chriſts Diſciples.

8. Chriſt forbids Fornication: and the Pope ordaineth it, in ſuffering publick Stewes in *Rome* and other places, that bring him in great profit.

9 The

9. The Pope likewiſe ſhewes himſelfe contrary unto Chriſt in greatneſſe and Worldly pompe. It is an admirable thing to ſee him in his Pontificalibus, crowned with three Crownes, or carried upon mens ſhoulders through the City of *Rome*, attended with *Suitzers* and other guards, both a Horſe-back and a Foot; and to ſee the people upon their knees worſhipping him in the ſtreets.

10. In a word, The Pope is abſolutely contrary unto Chriſt, in magnificence of apparell, garments, moveables, Horſes, and Officers; all which he hath in great number. *Item*, in meats, drinks, baths, unctions, corporal delights, pleaſures, Muſick, Playes, ſports, and all Earthly contentments. Wherefore the Conſequence of my Argument is moſt true, and therefore none ought to doubt but

but thar he is that Antichriſt ſpoken of in the Word of God. *Item*, That that Congregation which acknowledgeth him for its Head, is not the Church of Chriſt, but the Synagogue of Antichriſt, from which we ought to ſeparate our ſelves, according to Gods command, *Apoc.* 18. 4. and cleave to the Reformed Church, which is the true Church, the onely Pillar of Truth, out of which there is no Salvation.

Apoc. 14. 9. 10. *If any man worſhip the Beaſt and his Image, and receive his marke in his Forehead, or in his hand, the ſame ſhall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is powred out without mixture into the Cup of his indignation, and he ſhall be tormented with fire and brimſtone in the preſence of the holy Angels, and in the preſence of the Lambe.*

FINIS.

Imprimatur,

Tho. Wykes *R. P.*
Epiſc. Lond. Capell.
Domeſt.